

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 00585652 1



STUDIES
LITERARY AND HISTORICAL
IN THE
ODES OF HORACE.



STUDIES
LITERARY AND HISTORICAL
IN THE
ODES OF HORACE

BY

A. W. VERRALL, M.A.

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

London :
MACMILLAN AND CO.

1884

[The Right of Translation and Reproduction is reserved.]

4393
21/8/90

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SON,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PA

6411

Z5V47

TO THE REVEREND

E. C. WICKHAM, M.A.

MASTER OF WELLINGTON COLLEGE,
AND LATE FELLOW OF NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD.

MY DEAR MR WICKHAM,

It is with great pleasure that I avail myself of your permission to address this little book to you.

It is in itself satisfactory to connect my work in this way with my old school and to commend myself to the recollection of my friends at Wellington.

But it is especially fortunate for me that in doing this I can also remember myself to you and present my respects to a well-known expositor of Horace. Essays like these, on points perhaps not before worked out in a subject extremely familiar, appear under one certain disadvantage. It is impossible to exhibit the ninety-nine cases of agreement with predecessors, which answer to each one of disagreement: and consequently what is actually said labours under a suspicious appearance of dissent. It is something therefore that, in submitting my suggestions to you, I can so easily disclaim the pretence to be the beginning of wisdom.

Some might think—but you will not, nor will our best critics in England—that my views are condemned beforehand, when I postulate that the *Odes* of Horace, as we have them, are

substantially the work of the author, all of them genuine, all arranged and divided according to the poet's intention. That there are errors, some not unimportant, no one would deny, and upon some of these, where occasion offered, I have slipped in a word. But with the correction of the text these essays have little to do. Their real purpose I need not here anticipate.

With much respect I subscribe myself,

My dear Mr Wickham,

Yours very sincerely,

A. W. VERRALL.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
Nov. 20, 1884.

PREFACE.

These Essays represent in a more formal shape so much as seemed worth publishing of a course of lectures delivered in Trinity College, Cambridge. The preparation for this course led me to give several months to the study of the *Odes*: when I had finished I was tempted to push further, and finally resolved upon the present book. In fitting it for the Press, as upon other occasions, I have received much help from my colleague and friend Mr F. J. H. JENKINSON.

Perhaps I need scarcely add that I only am responsible for the substance.

A. W. V.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
ESSAY I. MELPOMENE	1
ESSAY II. MURENA	11
Note A. (Murena)	83
Note B. (Maecenas)	87
ESSAY III. THE HISTORICAL POEMS and the Arrangement of THE THREE BOOKS	90
ESSAY IV. LAMIA	121
ESSAY V. QVAM TIBERIS LAVIT	134
Note C. (Ode I. 20)	146
ESSAY VI. VENUS AND MYRTALE	150
ESSAY VII. EUTERPE	173
Index	195

MELPOMENE.

WHY did Horace place his lyric poetry under the patronage of the tragic muse? Why, when his minute labour had at length completed the three books, whose immortality he so surely anticipates, why, of all the Nine, did he invite Melpomene to 'take a pride by service won' and to place upon his brow the wreath which crowned the poet victorious at the Pythian games?

sume superbiam
quaesitam meritis, et mihi Delphica
lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam.

It is true that in a merely formal aspect the functions of the tragic muse are not alien to the work of an artist in lyric metre. Melpomene, as Horace says¹, had received the gift of the lyre, had been no more than a lyrist once, and to the end made no small use of the lyric art. But the lyrics of tragedy, after all, are tragic lyrics, and must serve her main purpose, to awake fear and pity, to set forth the sadness of human life and destiny.

Now the *Odes* of Horace, to judge them by our common impression, might be described perhaps somewhat as follows:—they are a collection of short exquisitely finished pieces in verse, for the most part disconnected in subject; the topics are generally light, the chief being love and wine; not unfrequently, however, the favourite theme is developed into moralizing upon the brevity of these and other pleasures, with the Epicurean conclusion that we should enjoy the moment and at the

¹ I. 24. 3.

same time be on our guard against excess; here and there are poems, chiefly occasional, upon patriotic and political themes, in which the poet, as an adherent of Augustus, laments the waste of the civil wars and the decline of Roman virtue, proclaims the need of repose and celebrates the exploits and the projects of the emperor; here and there, especially in the public poems, are passages of a lofty eloquence, but in general the style, like the sentiment, preserves the level of moderation, and is remarkable rather for the grace, terseness and point, which have made the poet an unfailing source of quotation, than for the strength or the subtlety of the feelings expressed. This estimate, which strikes, I think, a fair balance between the numerous critics of the poet and his numberless admirers, might be supported by references *ad libitum*, if it were not rather a waste of time to prove that we do not generally regard Horace, even in his Odes, as a tragic poet. In fact, the controversies of criticism leave the present question untouched. Whether we grant or not that Horace was really, or for lyrical purposes, a pessimist, whether we regard his love poetry as the best possible picture of the emotion on the sensual side, or as a very skilful exercise upon themes recommended by the practice of the Greek lyrists but otherwise rather unsuitable to the Roman imitator (good names might be cited for both views), whether we think he succeeded best under the inspiration of national feelings, or think, on the other hand, that in essaying public topics he went rather beyond his limit, and, in spite of many purple patches, proves himself on the whole more artificial than artistic (respectable patronage is again divided)—the question still remains, where is the tragedy? Horace passes, and with reason, for “a thoroughly modest man,” just and correct in his appreciation both of others and of himself. Could he find no more decorous name than that of *Melpomene* to subscribe to a miscellany, as it would appear to be, of *madrigals*, *moralties*, and national hymns—perfect, let us say, of their kind, but in kind surely anything rather than tragic?

Pathos and sublimity, and before all, pathos, are the gifts of *Melpomene*, and if Horace is occasionally sublime, it is a

commonplace of Horatian criticism that he is not usually pathetic. If a lover of the Odes were asked to name a poem, not a phrase, a line, or a stanza, but a whole poem, of which the main effect and purpose is pathetic, he would probably fix on the lament for Quintilius (l. 24)—indeed, missing this, could hardly give any answer that would not be open to dispute. But this example, so far from offering a solution of the problem here proposed, brings out the difficulty in the most forcible manner; for it is precisely in the lament for Quintilius, and there only, that we find the poet invoking the name which he has chosen for the ascription of his whole work—

Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus
tam cari capitis? praecepe lugubres
cantus, Melpomene.

Teach me, Melpomene, songs of mourning. Horace then, it seems, like the author of *In Memoriam*, thought of Melpomene as

owning but a little art
To lull with song an aching heart
And render human love his dues¹.

He meant by her name, what every one must mean by it, who has meaning enough to use one word rather than another, and therefore, we must suppose, ascribed his work to her, because she rather than any of her sisters had inspired it. And when², by way of explaining the singular fact that the muse of *tragedy* should be asked for a *dirge*, the scholiast on Apollonius is called upon to testify that Melpomene was said to be the inventor of the song in general—λέγεται εὐρηκέναι ᾠδὴν—and the scholiast in turn calls the poet Rhianus, to assure us that “it makes no difference whether one Muse is invoked, or all the Muses, for, as he says, *All hear if thou pronounce the name of one* (πᾶσαι δ’ εἰσαίουσι, μιᾶς ὅτε τοῦνομα λέξεις)”; we must surely reply, first that the scholiast’s difficulty is a difficulty only for a scholiast; but further, that if Rhianus really thought to call one Muse or to call another an indifferent matter, then for

¹ *In Memoriam* xxxvii.

² See Orelli on l. 24.

him it probably was so, since on those terms none was likely to come; and further still—for Rhianus seems to have been a real poet and no mean one—that the words cited from him do not imply the scholiast's absurd canon, but, on the contrary, do imply the canon of common sense and common taste, that in the absence of such explanation as Rhianus gives a special invocation would have a special meaning. Vergil, writing his immense epic, and needing the help of every power he can invoke, may of course conceive himself as attended by all the choir, and may for variety appeal to them sometimes without mention of any name (*Pandite nunc Helicon, deae*), sometimes with the addition of a name (*Vos, O Calliope, precor, adspirate canenti*), and sometimes by the name of one only (*Nunc age, qui reges, Erato,...quis Latio fuerit status, expediam*¹); and Rhianus, for anything that appears to the contrary, may have had equally good reason for expressing himself as he did. At all events Horace did not misname his Muses or prick for them, like sheriffs, in a list. When he desires to symbolize his difficulties in contending with metrical forms invented for a language sweeter and more copious than his own, he writes that his happier inspirations are found

si neque tibus
Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton,

sufficiently designating the Greek givers of musical sound and varied rhythm, even if we were not told that Euterpe invented the pipe or that Polyhymnia had a special acquaintance with *μῦθοι*². When he meditates a strain longer than his wont, he seeks the unwearied goddess of epos—

Descende caelo et dic age tibia
regina longum, Calliope, melos³.

When he hesitates whom to choose for celebration from the

¹ Even so, the selection of the name is not quite indifferent. In *Æn.* 7. 37, Vergil is about to narrate the *primae exordia pugnae*, the beginning of the war in Italy, i.e. the rivalry for the

hand of Lavinia. The invocation of Erato foreshows the theme.

² I. 1.

³ III. 4. 1.

historic roll of Roman glories, it is to the historic Clio that he turns—

Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri
tibia sumis celebrare, Clio¹?

He could no more call Calliope Clio or Clio Melpomene than he could describe the song of Simonides as *Maeonian* or the song of Homer as *Cean*².

The more closely we examine the epilogue (III. 30) as a whole, the more we shall feel the force of the concluding invocation. For it is distinctly a surprise, a transition, an epigram. The success which the poet claims, though durable, seems, up to the last phrase, to be carefully limited. Originality in transforming Greek metres³ to Roman equivalents, and the power to fix words in the memory—these are merits which Horace sees in his work, and these no one would deny to him. So far the epilogue answers exactly to the prologue; there he was seeking the help of Euterpe and of Polyhymnia, and here he seems to say that he has found it. Then let *Polyhymnia* or *Euterpe* crown him. Or if Horace was hurried and could not conveniently bring either of them in—why not *Mnemosyne*, mother of all the Muses, patroness of memory, and most suitable to a *monumentum aere perennius*? Or *Musa* simply⁴, which the modern school-boy could immediately stretch to the space by the help of a quite permissible '*precor*'? But the poet thought the office belonged to Melpomene, the lady of sorrows. Nor was this a sudden freak of fancy. He thought the same when he concluded the book itself, as distinct from the epilogue, with the theme of Fortune playing her proud game, whose toys are the wealth and the ambitions of men⁵. For this *ludus Fortunae*, this *perilous hazard* in which men rise and fall, played as it had been on the vastest scale before the eyes of Horace and his contemporaries, is the very subject which, in the opinion of the poet, required *the Muse of stern tragedy* to aid—

¹ I. 12. 1.

² I. 6. 2, II. 1. 38.

³ III. 30. 13.

⁴ As in II. 1. 37, II. 12. 13, III. 3. 70.

⁵ III. 29. 25—the end, and specially
v. 49.

Motum ex Metello consule civicum
 bellique causas et vitia et modos
ludumque Fortunae gravesque
 principum amicitias et arma
 nondum expiatis uncta cruoribus,
periculosae plenum opus aleae,
 tractas et incedis per ignes
 suppositos cineri doloso.
 paullum severae *musa tragoediae*
 desit theatris¹.

So writes Horace to Pollio upon his projected history of the civil wars. But the analogy so suggested does not help us very far. It is true that two poems in the first book² celebrate the power of Fortune and may be referred, with the highest probability, to one of the chief events of contemporary history³; and further, that out of the eighty-eight poems in the collection, about a dozen have a more or less historical character, and are even so arranged as to make a sort of historical framework to the rest⁴. But it is obviously impossible to say that the vicissitudes of public affairs occupy a main share in the book, impossible that the tragedy which, it seems, helped to inspire Horace, can be the same broad tragedy of Roman politics which summoned Melpomene to the study of Asinius Pollio.

Whatever Horace meant by his invocation, at all events he did not repent of it. Many years after, when Augustus, moved by the general admiration and his own knowledge of durable art, induced the poet against his inclination⁵ to resume lyric work and to devote an additional 'book' to the military glories of the imperial family, it is to Melpomene that he returns thanks for his established fame, declaring fit for no ambition more vulgar than renown in Æolian song the man

¹ I have followed Ritter in referring *periculosae aleae* to the subject of Pollio's work and not to the risk which he himself might run in writing it. Cf. Tac. *Hist.* i. 2, *opus adgredior optimi casibus*. The majority are in favour of the other interpretation, but the metaphor *aleae* (cast of the dice),

compared with *ludus* above, is to me decisive. The question, however, is not here necessarily material.

² xxxiv. xxxv.

³ See Essay III.

⁴ See Essay III.

⁵ *coegit* is the expression of Suetonius.

quem tu, Melpomene, semel
nascentem placido lumine videris¹.

I cannot but see evidence in these passages that Horace thought the dominant note of his three books to be the note of pathos, and that the Roman public, or at least the aristocratic and cultivated coteries to which the Augustan literature was in the first instance addressed, agreed in this estimate, and were affected according to the poet's intention. It is equally clear on the other hand that the prevalent modern view has been different, and it becomes interesting and promises to be of some importance to a right understanding of the *Odes*, to discover if possible the cause of the difference. It is certainly not that modern readers have not observed the element of melancholy in them. It would be difficult to miss; and many critics call attention to it, one speaking of the "profound sadness" of certain poems, another of their "despairing pessimism" and the like. Those who so speak generally add that the melancholy is merely the background of the picture, since it leads up, like the pictures of pleasure, to the Epicurean moral that we must enjoy while we may. But this, though formally true, must not lead us to hasty conclusions as to the comparative prominence of the light and dark colour. To say that the sadness of Horace expresses itself in the form "How brief are our pleasures!" is only to say that it is the sadness of an Epicurean, and the sadness of an Epicurean is no merrier than other sadness; it is perhaps more gloomy than any. And certainly, if quantity were the measure, we should not easily believe that the bitterness of the *Odes* is but put in as a spice to the sweet. The lighter poems, whether as being really better work, or perhaps because they have been better understood, have a preeminence in the recollection, and the admirer of Horace, if asked to justify, will probably turn to *Ulla si juris*² or *Donec gratus eram*³ or *Quid fles, Asterie*⁴. But

¹ iv. 3. 1. The whole poem is full of allusions to the original prologue and epilogue. Cf. iv. 3. 3—9 with i. 1. 3—8, iv. 3. 11, 12 with i. 1. 30, iii. 30. 13, iv. 3. 9 with iii. 30. 8, iv. 3. 15

with i. 1. 35, and see the commentaries.

² ii. 8.

³ iii. 9.

⁴ iii. 7.

the balance is all the other way, and it may be worth while briefly to mark the true proportions. Upon the First Book, in despite of a desperate commencement (II. III. IV.) and the reverberating emphasis of

pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas
regumque turres,

gaiety on the whole prevails. IX. is quiet, XI. ambiguous, XIII. savage, XIV. and XV. foreboding. In XXIV. we have the most piteous, in XXXIV. and XXXV. perhaps the gravest of the poet's tones. Others are neutral. But half the book at least is in the light; XII. and XXXVII. are odes of genuine triumph, XVII. and XXII. pictures of complete, if fanciful, happiness, XXVI. and XXVII. XXX. and XXXVI. wholly and unaffectedly merry.

Among the twenty poems of the Second Book are placed the inimitable *vers de société* addressed to 'Xanthias of Phocis' and to 'Barine', both, for the present purpose, neutral. The feast of Horace and the companion of his old campaigns (VII.) represents a joy which may not have ceased to appear joyous when the collection was published; with what feelings Maecenas is likely to have contemplated the picture of his conjugal happiness in XII. we shall presently see. But for these four poems the book might be called a dirge. It bears strong marks of having been written under the influence of ill-health. Three times the poet is found contemplating the prospect of his own death¹; the last of these anticipations is appropriately followed by a rapt vision (XIX.) in which the poet sees the friendly god of poetic inspiration surrounded by the ensigns of his power over this upper world and over the unseen horrors of death; and in the next and concluding poem he fancies himself already entering into a new form of life and speaking words of consolation to the friends who surround an imaginary pyre².

¹ II. 6, II. 17, II. 18. 38 compared with *ibid.* 10. II. 16. 29—32 is also suggestive, taken in connexion with the subject of the whole poem, and compared with III. 1. 41 foll. On II. 6 see H. T. Plüss' *Horaz-Studien*, p. 140,

for which admirable book I take this first opportunity of expressing my thanks.

² On II. 20 see Plüss *Horaz-Studien*, p. 179. His general explanation seems to me most attractive.

Over III. IX. XI. XIII. XIV. XVI. lies, darker or less dark, the same shadow, lending an expression of menace and prophecy to the interposed warnings against passion, luxury, avarice, and pride (II. V. X. XV.). And as if to set all this in the strongest relief, the introductory poem, after rising gradually to the tone of tragedy itself—

qui gurgēs aut quæ flumina lugubris
ignara belli? quod mare Dauniae
non decoloravere caedes?
quæ caret ora cruore nostro?—

drops suddenly to the ineffectual rebuke

sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis
Cææ retractes munera neniæ
mecum Dionæo sub antro
quære modos levioꝛe plectro.

The wayward Muse may be admonished to mind her jests and to confine herself to the grotto of Love, but it is to the tomb and to the 'office of the Simonidean dirge' that she obstinately returns.

The Third Book is as a whole neither dark nor bright; to analyse it in detail would be to anticipate much that is to be said in the next essay. The moral of the whole is summed up in the somewhat grim quiet of the concluding address to Mæcenas—

quod adest memento
componere æcus; cætera fluminis
ritu feruntur.

But we can now put more definitely the question—Why, since there is no lack of sadness in Horace, do we not find him tragic, though his contemporaries did? On consideration, it will appear, I think, that the reason is this. His lamentations and his musings, as we read them, are always conceived to be *general* and *without particular application*. Pathos belongs to persons, and specially to the affections of men towards men. The lament for Quintilius is pathetic because there is human love in it, not merely because it is sad. In such lines as

æqua tellus
pauperi recluditur
regumque pueris,

or in

si figit adamantinos
summis verticibus dira Necessitas
clavos, non animum metu,
non mortis laqueis expedit caput,

the sadness is certainly not less, but as we do not suppose either of these thoughts to have had more meaning to Horacè or to Maecenas than to any one now, there is no pathos. It is a question therefore to be asked, whether we are right in this impression.

MURENA.

THE years 24 and 23 before Christ mark the culmination of the fortune of Augustus and a crisis in the history of the Roman state. When the emperor, after holding his eleventh (and ninth successive) consulship for a small part of the year 23, resigned it with the usual forms, and appointed in his place a man conspicuous for piously cultivating the memory of the regicides Brutus and Cassius, a speculator upon the political future might well have supposed, that the great revolution was successfully accomplished and that, if anxiety was not over, the labour of restoration and reconstruction throughout the wasted territory of the republic might henceforward be carried on in peace. Mere lapse of time had done much. Since the assumption of power by the first Caesar nearly a quarter of a century had passed. To the best part of the living generation the idea of a personal chief ruler had been familiar and even attractive from their earliest recollection. Few men still in the full vigour of life could remember much of the consulship of Cicero (forty years distant) and the last days of a truly independent senate. Varro, the illustrious antiquary and the last 'Ciceronian', was gone, after a long old age of literary work in the service of the new government. The survivors of Pharsalia, or such of them as had escaped the ordinary and extraordinary casualties of the triumvirate, were grey-headed men; and even the youngest survivors of Philippi, whom ambition or youthful enthusiasm for a name had drawn to the losing side, might be supposed to share the feelings so adroitly suggested by their comrade Horace,

and like him, as they witnessed the joyful reception of the emperor on his return from Spain in the year 24, and endeavoured in the security of a general peace to recall the republican ardours of the year 42, might say to themselves, between a smile and a shrug, that in more senses than one they were no longer the men they had been "in the consulship of Plancus¹". The final struggle with Antonius was indeed recent, but in this, as in the war with Sextus Pompeius, Rome and Italy had been almost universally on the Caesarean side², and even clients and intimate friends of Antonius had to excuse themselves for not taking active part against him. Those who finally adhered to him were not merely beaten but discredited and effaced. The popularity of the emperor, tested by his severe illness and recovery during the Spanish campaign, received the amplest testimony in votes of congratulation and general rejoicing. For many years past, since Maecenas, before the return of Augustus from the conquest of Cleopatra, had detected and crushed the conspiracy of the younger Lepidus, no attempt, as far as we know, had been made upon the emperor's life, and Augustus was provided with the best shield against assassins³ in the person of the young Marcellus, heir to the blood of the Julii and to the veneration of the people towards the martyr of the democracy, the dictator Julius Caesar, and promising to sustain worthily his hereditary part. When we consider what was the prospect at this time and what was the actual sequel, it is not surprising but highly significant to find that the Autobiography of Augustus concluded here, being continued 'as far as the Cantabrian war, and no further⁴'. At the close of that war, warned by the sickness which had confined him to his bed at Tarraco for the greater part of the campaign, he had notified, as it were, his retirement to the functions of peace by the foundation and title of *Augusta Emerita* (Merida)⁵. He might well

¹ III. 14.² Suet. *Aug.* 17.⁴ Suet. *Aug.* 85.

³ The premature adoption of the infant sons of Agrippa (B.C. 17) is expressly referred by Dion Cassius to the desire of discouraging conspiracy. Dion 54. 18.

⁵ As a fact, he never again took part in actual war, though he was at the scene of war both in the East and in Germany.

hope that under the government of himself or of his most probable successor the celebration of the birthdays of Brutus and Cassius in the houses of great noblemen holding office by his appointment would soon become as harmless a ceremony as the wearing of the 'royal oak' by the subjects of King George the Third. The point of most danger was the possibility of collision between Marcellus and Agrippa, but against this either time or the disinterested fidelity of Agrippa himself might be expected to guard¹.

Under these auspices was drawn the settlement between the republican past and the imperial present, from which the new time may in one sense be said to begin. The one feeling from which opposition was to be feared was the restlessness of the aristocratic families deprived of the natural prey of their ambition, the republican offices and especially the consulship. To the public at large these offices were perfectly indifferent; indeed for many reasons, political and superstitious, they would have felt more comfortable if Augustus would have made himself perpetual sole consul or dictator at once². Not so the representatives of the old senatorial families. To them it seemed the natural object of life to become one of the two coequal magistrates of the commonwealth, and a Rome in which only one man could be consul in each year, and that with a 'colleague' who was also generalissimo of the army from year to year without intermission, was not at all a Rome to their mind. To satisfy this sentiment as far as possible, Augustus resigned the consulship for the year 23 as already mentioned, and in his thirty-six subsequent years, except on two occasions of special religious interest to the imperial family, never accepted the office again³. The traditional offices of the city were to be open as before to the traditional competitors without rivalry or interference from the monarch, who on his part took security for the exercise of those

¹ It was at this time that Agrippa was sent or retired to the East. The anxiety of Augustus after his recovery from his second illness in 23 to prove that he had not taken upon himself

actually to name a successor is easily understood. Public expectation was fixed upon Marcellus. Dion 53. 30.

² Dion 54. 1.

³ Dion 53. 32. Suet. *Aug.* 26.

offices in harmony with the requirements of the empire, and not, as in the close of the republic, for private aggrandisement and public confusion, by the general veto conferred under the name of the 'tribunician power', and the abnormal power of consulting the senate granted without respect to the special privileges of office¹. Presuming loyalty, there was no reason why this compromise should not work; the functions conceded to the aristocracy, real and not merely titular, afforded a sufficient field for all but purely mischievous ambition; and for a few months the 'felicissimus status', as it is called by the imperialist Velleius², showed a fair promise. This was in the spring.

In the autumn Marcellus died, and the balance on which the public peace depended was destroyed. Caesar was now without an heir, infant or major. Tiberius, the elder of his stepsons, was already entering upon public life, and had long ago taken on occasions of ceremony the second place after Marcellus³, but though the legal forms might convert a Claudius into a Julius, they could not transfer the veneration of the populace to a representative of the most unpopular of Roman families, and there is no sign that Tiberius⁴ was at this time regarded as a possible successor,—indeed, the contrary is implied by the prompt marriage of the emperor's daughter to Agrippa and the hasty adoption of their infant children—a striking proof how strong and how important was the Julian sentiment in the popular mind. By the death of Marcellus the prospect of the small but wealthy and unscrupulous clique, who desired the full restoration of the republican forms, was entirely changed. Now, if the emperor could be removed, the chances were strongly in their favour, and for the next twenty years, assassination-plots followed each other in rapid succession. The brief period which separated the first of these from the death of the heir was occupied in fruitless attempts at conciliation⁵. In spite of

¹ Dion 53. 32. The historian represents the transaction, *more suo*, as an interchange of compliments.

² II. 91.

³ Suet. *Tib.* 6.

⁴ See the emphasis laid upon the Claudian descent of Tiberius in Suet. *Tib.* 1—3.

⁵ Dion 54. 1—3.

the popular clamour, and almost at personal risk, Augustus refused to assume either the dictatorship or the office of perpetual censor, and procured the appointment as censors, in pursuance of the new policy, of two men conspicuous for sufferings inflicted by the enemies of the aristocracy. He did not however satisfy, as may be supposed, either the populace, whose dislike to a magistracy of nobles found an evil omen in trivial accidents, or the nobility, who saw that the competence of their magistrates did not exclude the activity of the monarch¹. His behaviour, studiously *civil*, even to the acceptance of public affronts, was taken by the more rash spirits as a proof of conscious weakness², and the affectation of friendship was terminated within the year 22 by the detection of a formidable plot.

Of this event, the history of Dion Cassius, our only continuous account of the period, tells us much indeed in proportion to the scale of the work, but by no means as much as we have good reason for wishing to know; and the incidental notices of other writers do not repair the deficiency. The exact date is not given, but the general order of the narrative seems to imply that it was in the earlier part of the year³. The principal in the plot was a Fannius Caepio, of an aristocratic family, and apparently a senator⁴. From the silence of Velleius, who sketches the political antecedents of Egnatius, the leader of the next conspiracy in the year 19, it may be inferred that neither Fannius, nor his unnamed accomplices, had borne any important part in public

¹ Dion 54. 2.

² Dion 54. 3.

³ The dedication of the temple of *Jupiter Tonans*, which from the circumstances would probably fall in the summer season, followed the suppression of the conspiracy. Dion *ibid.* 4.

⁴ That the leaders of the plot were senators is suggested by the language both of Dion and Velleius. Dion *l.c.* ὑπὸ τῶν εὐ φρονούντων [ὁ Αὔγουστος] ἐπηνεῖτο, ὥστε καὶ τὸ τὴν βουλὴν ἀθροίζειν ὁσάκις αὐτὸς ἐβελήσῃ λαβεῖν (this of course must have been a senatorial

vote), τῶν δὲ ἄλλων τινὲς κατεφρόνησαν αὐτοῦ.....Φάννιος μὲν γὰρ Καίπιων κ.τ.λ. As οἱ εὐφρονούντες were part of the senate, the τινὲς would seem to be another part. Vell. II. 91 cognomen [Augusto] Planci sententia consensus universi senatus populiue Romani (i.e. a senatorial vote) indidit. erant tamen qui hunc felicissimum statum odissent: quippe L. Murena et Fannius Caepio diversis moribus etc....neque multo post Rufus Egnatius, per omnia gladiatori quam senatori propior, etc.

affairs; the vague statement that he had "the worst character" may perhaps show that he had not the best, and that the conspirators in general resembled Catiline rather than Catulus. For enemies of this kind the emperor and his friends might have looked. But a surprise was in store for them.

L. Licinius Murena (otherwise L. Licinius Varro Murena¹) was perhaps the last man whom the imperialists would have been disposed to suspect. His brother² Proculius, to whom he was under great obligations, was among the emperor's most valued friends; his "sister" was married to Maecenas, who without any regular office, was a sort of minister, with especial charge of the city, and highest, Agrippa being absent, in the emperor's confidence³. His manners were frank to the extreme of rudeness⁴. He was now very wealthy, and having had experience *utriusque fortunæ*, both in public and private affairs, was unlikely to imperil his prosperity. He was not out of favour, but on the contrary had been certainly distinguished and, it has even been thought⁵, employed by Augustus upon the faith of his connexions and in spite of a disadvantageous career. Velleius, on this side an unimpeachable witness, allows that on the eve of the conspiracy 'poterat videri bonus'. He seems by his name to have been the representative and was probably the son of L. Licinius Murena, consul in 62, who was afterwards defended by Cicero⁶. Of his age we have no evidence, but our first notice of him shows that whether from youth or prudence he preserved a tolerable fortune through the ruin of the *optimates* from Pharsalia to Philippi and was a person of some standing before the rupture between Octavian and Antonius⁷. In the description given by Horace of the journey to Brundisium, on which he accompanied

¹ On his names see Note A.

² Or cousin, *frater* being ambiguous. See Schol. on Hor. *Od.* II. 2. 4.

³ On the position of Maecenas see Note B.

⁴ Dion 54. 3.

⁵ On the question whether he was the commander of the expedition against the Salassi in B.C. 25, see Note A.

⁶ Drumann, *Geschichte Roms*, *Licini Murenæ*, and Smith, *Dict. Biog.*

⁷ I here make the usual assumption, that the 'Murena' of *Od.* III. 19, *Sat.* I. 5. 38 and the 'Licinius' of *Od.* II. 10 are identical with each other and with the conspirator. The sequel will, I hope, place this beyond doubt.

Maecenas, the only person not a member of the embassy who is mentioned as giving the negotiators private entertainment is Murena, who though absent himself placed his house at Formiae at their disposal—

in Mamurrarum lassi deinde urbe manemus
Murena praeibente domum, Capitone culinam¹.

The connexion with Fonteius Capito suggested by this passage is significant (for Capito was *Antoni, non ut magis alter, amicus*), and prepares us to find, that in the final contest of parties decided at Actium Murena was among the losers. The ancient commentaries on Horace describe him as ‘*spoliatus bonis in bello civili*’². Whatever latitude should be given to this expression, the better testimony of Horace himself shows that the loss of property, consideration, or both reduced him to a condition which could be called ‘adversity’ and be supposed to require encouragement and consolation—*Non, si male nunc, et olim sic erit*³. This prophecy was fulfilled with a rapidity and completeness not often vouchsafed to poetic inspiration, for Murena, ruined in the year 30 was, before the year 22, not only living, as we shall see, in extravagant and dangerous splendour, but actually a member of the college of augurs and of such importance as to be ‘*advocatus*’ in a political cause on behalf of a magistrate accused of misconduct in his province⁴. The significance of this last fact according to Roman ideas of ‘advocacy’ may be estimated from an expression of Suetonius, who describes a certain Q. Calpenus, who descended to the ignominy of fighting as a gladiator, as ‘*senator quondam actorque causarum*’⁵.

Now these facts must suggest the question—how did Murena become so suddenly rich? The authorities who tell us of his losses add that Procleius treated him very liberally⁶. But it would be absurd to suppose that either Procleius or

¹ Sat. i. 5. 38. The most probable date is B.C. 38.

² On Od. ii. 2. 5. The scholia—and those on this passage in particular—are not precisely accurate. See the edd. of Horace *ad loc.*

³ Od. ii. 10. 17.

⁴ Hor. Od. iii. 19. Dion 54. 3.

⁵ *Iul.* 39.

⁶ Schol. on Hor. Od. ii. 2. 5. The text of Horace is vague.

Maecenas, though they might protect their kinsman against the full consequences of his political mistake, would provide him with the means of supporting the position indicated by the descriptions of Horace and Dion (there is indeed no reason to think that Proculius could have done so, if he would). The augurate alone, to say nothing of details to be presently noticed, is a proof of very great wealth. The sacred colleges under the Empire were of no political significance; the augurate, for example, was conferred by Augustus upon Claudius, afterwards emperor, as a suitable decoration for a princely person supposed unequal to serious employments. But these quasi-religious appointments, besides their historic dignity, had a certain indirect importance, since upon the liberality of the colleges depended, in great part, the proper performance of the feasts exhibitions and other functions, without which the government would have been neither popular nor respectable. The revolution, with its new *fasti*, increased the occasions of expenditure; for instance, the foundation-year itself was celebrated by a quinquennial festival, for which the sacred colleges became responsible¹. Feasts proverbially sumptuous², fees so heavy as to embarrass a prince³, riches too tempting for imperial cupidity⁴ are the conditions which accompany the sacred offices. And had it been possible for a man of moderate means to be an *augur*, Augustus could not afford to promote him. This point is of such importance to the history and literature of the time as to be worth a short digression.

When the Augustan writers inveigh against private luxury, and urge the duty of spending on public objects⁵, this is no mere sentiment or moral commonplace. If the richer classes in Rome and Italy had all rejected this duty, the enterprise of Augustus and Agrippa would have been impossible. The machinery by which the provinces were afterwards made profitable was mostly still to create, and the provinces themselves were exhausted. The chief expedients of imperial taxation in

¹ Dion 53. 1.

² Hor. Od. ii. 14. 28.

³ Suet. *Claud.* 9.

⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 49.

⁵ e.g. Hor. Od. ii. 15. 13—20, iii. 25. 45—50 etc.

Italy were still to be devised. The financial difficulty is put in the front, as conclusive against the attempt to change the form of government, in the argument between Agrippa and Maecenas, by which Dion, imitating Thucydides, sets forth the problem as it stood after the overthrow of Antonius. 'In a republic', says Agrippa, 'you can get money, the competition for public rewards induces men to spend and subscribe for public objects¹.' And this, though it was not the theory in Dion's own time, represents correctly enough the theory of the Roman republic and ancient republics in general. The wealthy contended for office by a sort of honest bribery, and corruption compensated for jobbery. Now the civil wars left an enormous load upon the state. Everything was in ruins. Rome itself, to remind the reader of one sufficient illustration, was in such a state that the Tiber, choked with rubbish, "made the city navigable", in the expressive phrase of Dion, with a sort of regularity. The roads, the harbours, the public buildings all required instant attention. And apart from public works, the government, with the army and the Roman populace upon its hands, had hard work to pay its way. Already in the contest with Antonius, Octavian had been rescued from a mutiny by the subscriptions of the loyal and wealthy Italians of the two upper orders, and in spite of the Egyptian booty the system of subscription, as well as the execution of particular works by rich persons, went on after the peace². Augustus wished for a regular taxation and at last, when floods and famine had enforced the necessity, wrested the consent of the senate, but this was many years later³. How grave was the situation in the interval a single fact will show. One of the worst vexations of the civil wars was the invasion of private lands by successive generals seeking settlements for their veteran troops. To put the matter on a proper footing was a first necessity for the government of peace. Now it was nearly twenty years from the battle of Actium before it could be undertaken⁴. The inadequacy of the revenue to the needs

¹ Dion 52. 6.

³ Dion 55. 24, *ib.* 31, 56, 28 foll.

² Hor. Od. III. 25. 45. Dion 53. 2,
ib. 22 etc., 54. 26 etc.

⁴ B.C. 13. Dion 54. 25.

of the time is one cardinal fact of Augustus' reign. The 'resources of the empire', in the sense in which Trajan or even Tiberius might have used the expression, were adequate enough, but in the reign of Augustus the empire had yet to be created. Thus the severe economy of the emperor himself was no matter of personal taste or moral preference¹. The repeated purgation of the senate and the *equites*, by the expulsion of the poor and the 'bad', had an object more immediately practical than the restitution of a dignified appearance to society. Good means and 'good' dispositions were required in those on whose purses the government expected to draw.

Under such circumstances, how a man 'ruined in the civil war' could within a few years after, with whatever advantages of connexion, be in a position either to obtain or retain such a place as the augurate under the government of the victors, is a question not to be passed over. In the case of Licinius Murena, however, special circumstances suggest an answer. At some time or other he acquired the name of Varro². Between the years 30 and 22 he acquired a large fortune. When we remember that in this interval³ died, without natural heir, a Varro who was one of the richest men of his time, we have some reasons for putting these facts together, and conjecturing that Murena's money came from none other than *the* Varro, the scholar and antiquary M. Terentius. Long before he had sought a successor in the Licinian *gens*⁴; between the *Varrones* and the *Murenæ* there was certainly a connexion, though we do not know the exact relations⁵; and when at length he also 'cessit coemptis saltibus', no person known to have been then living is more likely than Licinius Murena to have received the main share of

¹ See the language attributed to Maecenas in Dion 52. 29.

² See Note A.

³ The year is commonly given as 28 (Smith *Dict. Biog.*). This seems to be not quite certain, owing to confusion in the text of Jerome (*ad. Euseb. Chron.*) on which the date depends. The above statement is safe, and the usual assumption

probably near. Varro died at 'nearly ninety', and this cannot have been very much later than 28.

⁴ He seems to have adopted the brother of the great Lucullus, but must have long survived him. See Drumann's *Geschichte Roms*, Pauly *Real-Enc.*, Smith *Dict. Biog.*

⁵ See Note A.

his parks and farms, his marbles, aviaries, rosaries, and scrolls. This succession, as I hope to show, will explain so much that it may reasonably be held certain. For the present, I note only that it explains completely the change in Murena's position—by the moral effect no less than by the material. Varro, charged with the public libraries, was both a loyal and a useful subject; for testamentary evidence to character the emperor had a peculiar respect; in the heir of Varro the adherent of Antonius might disappear, illustrating, with an inverted application, the language of Shakespeare—

Aumerle that was;
But that is lost for being Richard's friend,
And, madam, you must call him Rutland now.

However Murena obtained his wealth, he did not fulfil the remainder of the poet's prophecy—*contrahes vento nimium secundo turgida vela*. He made enemies on all sides, he took an opportunity, shortly before the conspiracy of Fannius, to insult Augustus himself in court, and when one of the accomplices, by name Castrius, betrayed the design to the emperor, Murena, "truly or by malice", was included in the charge. Before, however, the accused were arrested, the secret of the government was in turn betrayed. For this second discovery, which might well have cost the emperor's life, there was an explanation only too obvious. In spite of the near connexion of Maecenas with one of the accused, he was, as usual, the depositary of the emperor's secret on this occasion. The proof thus applied to his loyalty and fortitude was indeed severe, for he was passionately attached to his wife; on the other hand his fortunes were bound up with those of Augustus, and he had some years before distinguished himself for his silent energy in a great crisis, to which we shall presently refer. At any rate, he was treated as safe. But the vigour of Maecenas was occasional not habitual, and his vigilance at perilous moments was not more notorious than his willing return to all the refinements of indulgence at the earliest opportunity¹. Seven years of comparative security spent in a more than femi-

¹ See the passages of Velleius and Smith *Dict. Biog.*, article Maecenas. Seneca afterwards referred to, and

nine luxury, had not prepared him for the sudden bracing of his nerves required by this unexpected trial. Such at least seems to have been the account given not only by others but by himself in his repentant leisure. He told his wife that her brother was at the mercy of the government¹. The conspirators, including Murena, fled; they were indicted in absence by the young Tiberius, and being condemned, though not by a unanimous vote, were shortly afterwards put to death. The informer, it seems, was also tried but spared upon the personal solicitation of Augustus; it is noticed by Suetonius that this was the sole occasion on which he interfered with the course of justice².

The 'sensation' made by this event in Roman society, is, as Dion describes it, astounding, but under the circumstances not incredible. It was the first time that the Roman nobility witnessed such a court-tragedy, the beginning of 'the bloody peace' as the malcontents called it, when the time came for estimating the emperor's career³. That none of the accused were entirely innocent may be taken as confessed⁴, but a trial in absence is never satisfactory, and besides, in a case of treason so very near the throne, it is likely enough that the government could not or would not produce all their evidence. The imperialists, more enthusiastic than wise, insisted on voting thanksgivings as for a public triumph, and the dissatisfied party never forgave Augustus for permitting them. The height to which public feeling ran is shown by an amazing incident. The chief conspirator, Caepio, had been accompanied in his flight by two slaves, one of whom betrayed him to the pursuers, while the other endeavoured to defend him. The conspirator's father not only gave the faithful slave his freedom, but actually crucified the traitor, after parading him through the forum with a placard

¹ Suet. *Aug.* 66.

² *ib.* 56. *Tib.* 8.

³ Tac. *Ann.* i. *pacem...sed cruentam; ...caesos Romae Varrones, Egnatios, Iulos.*

⁴ The voting in the senatorial courts

was by ballot; immediately after this, it was ordained that when an accused person did not stand his trial, there should be no ballot, but a unanimous condemnation should be presumed. Dion *l.c.*

declaring his offence. The emperor took no notice. But if the emotions of society in general were deep, ineffaceable was the impression upon Maecenas. The blow to his private affections, though not light for an uxorious husband, was the least part of the calamity. The friendship and confidence of Augustus, the substance of his power (he seems to have had no office), was lost for the time, and for political purposes never perhaps, and certainly not until long afterwards recovered. No outward change in his position took place, for it was not the interest of either side to publish the quarrel; nor did his decline in favour attract general notice, until in the year 16 the creation of the praefecture of the city raised the enquiry why Maecenas, if any one, was not appointed¹. At that time another cause was found in the relations existing, or supposed to exist, between the emperor and the minister's wife. But the minister connected his disgrace with the ruin of his brother-in-law and reproached not only Murena but himself with having abused prosperity. Suppose, writes Seneca at the conclusion of an epistle recommending moderation, *suppose you allow your fortunes to grow yet higher; every advance will be an addition to your fear. I have a mind to quote you here what Maecenas said, speaking truth upon the rack, 'ipsa enim altitudo attonat summa'.—If you ask for the reference, it is in the book entitled 'Prometheus'; by 'attonat' he means 'attonita habet i.e. exposes to the thunder'; now would you accept any power whatsoever at the price of such an intoxicated style? Maecenas was a man of genius and would have been a fine specimen of Roman eloquence, had not prosperity impaired his vigour—I should say, his 'virility'—This is how you will end, unless you at once 'pull in your sails', unless you 'hug the shore', as he wished he had done, when it was too late².*

¹ See Note B.

² Sen. *Ep.* 19. Quid si fortunae etiam nunc permiseris crescere? quantum ad successum accesserit, accedet ad metum. Volo tibi hoc loco referre dictum Maecenatis, vera in ipso eculeo elocuti 'ipsa enim altitudo attonat summa'.

(Si quaeris in quo libro dixerit, in eo qui *Prometheus* inscribitur. Hoc voluit dicere 'attonita habet summa'. est ergo tanti ulla potentia, ut sit tibi tam ebrius sermo? ingeniosus vir ille fuit, magnum exemplum Romanae eloquentiae daturus, nisi illum enervasset

It cannot be by accident that these selections from Maecenas' 'Prometheus' reproduce not merely the metaphors but the words of the warning given by Horace to Murena—

Rectius vives, Licini, neque altum
semper urgendo, neque dum procellas
cautus horreseis nimium *premendo*
litus iniquum.....
saepius ventis agitur ingens
pinus et celsae graviore casu
decidunt turres *feriuntque summos*
fulgura montes.....
rebus angustis animosus atque
fortis appare, sapienter idem
contrahes vento nimium secundo
turgida vela.

Horace, as we shall presently see, intended a *contrast* between Murena and Maecenas. The self-accusing minister saw but too much resemblance, and repented that he had not practised or even exaggerated the caution recommended by the poet. Indeed jealous fortune could not possibly have found a heavier bolt. Even if the charge of indiscretion had not been true, if it could have been refuted—obviously a very difficult thing—there remained an imputation which he could not avoid. The most brilliant service which he had rendered, and the most important to his reputation¹, was the suppression of the younger Lepidus, who plotted to murder Augustus on his return from Alexandria. Maecenas then in charge of the city on Augustus' behalf, "concealing his knowledge of the rash

felicitas, immo castrasset). Hic te exitus manet, nisi iam '*contrahes vela*', nisi (quod ille serovoluit) '*terram leges*'. Maecenas, on his own confession as this passage shows, is Seneca's standing example of the dangers of too much good fortune and the enervating effects of luxury. (See also *Epp.* 92, 101, 114, 120.) He is introduced with much effect into the hollow colloquy on excess of riches between

Seneca and Nero placed by Tacitus before Seneca's fall. (*Ann.* xiv. 53. foll.) The illustration of the enfeeblement of character from the affectation of Maecenas' style is itself not a little affected, but it is pursued with great elaboration in *Sen. Ep.* 114. All these epistles contain frequent citations and touches from Horace.

¹ Velleius mentions him in this connexion only, II. 88.

design, watched him with perfect calmness, and then, by astonishing speed, crushed him without the slightest disturbance or agitation, and cut short a horrible enterprise which would have revived the civil war¹." It was the very irony of fate that the next assassin should be of Maecenas' own family, and that the discovery should have been left to another. The comparison between the years 724 and 732 was but too suggestive, and that the minister's enemies did not miss it may be gathered from the description of him by Velleius, which as a piece of adroit sarcasm is worth transcribing. The praise just quoted is thus introduced—"erat tunc urbis custodiis praepositus C. Maecenas, equestri sed splendido genere natus, vir, ubi res vigiliam exigeret, *sane exsomnia*, providens atque agendi sciens, *simul vero aliquid ex negotio remitti posset, otio ac mollitiis paene ultra feminam fluens*, non minus Agrippa Caesari carus, sed minus honoratus; quippe vixit angusti clavi, paene contentus, nec minora consequi potuit sed non tam concupivit²." The unkind allusions to the sufferings of Maecenas from want of sleep³, to the noble descent and moderate desires, upon which his poetical beneficiaries are always insisting⁴, indicate that the antithesis of vigilance and effeminacy is not without a sting, and the contrast above indicated shows the point of it. It may be observed that Velleius, the friend and companion of Tiberius who indicted the conspirators, had exceptional means of knowing the impression made by these events at the time upon the imperial circle.

We now come to the question, What is the relation between these events and the *Odes* of Horace? Were the Three Books, in their present form, published before or after them? When were the odes written, which name Murena, II. 10 and III. 19,

¹ Vell. *l.c.*

² *ib.* For *angusti clavi* (so the MSS., see ed. Halm., Teubner series) some read *angusto clavo*, joining it with *contentus*. If any alteration is necessary, I would suggest *angusticlavius* (cf. *laticlavius*), but the genitive (of quality) seems admissible. Others alter

paene (*pene* MSS. as usual), but this is clearly right.

³ Plin. *H. N.* 7. 52.

⁴ Propertius iv. 8. Maecenas, eques Etrusco de sanguine regum, Intra fortunam qui cupis esse tuam, and Horace *passim*.

and when published¹? Often as these questions have been raised, the arguments on them scarcely show, I think, a sense of their importance. Literary chronology has seldom so vital an interest. It signifies little, for instance, whether the *Odes* came out before or after the year 20.² The success of Augustus and Tiberius in cajoling or terrifying the Parthians had no particular effect on Horace, or Maecenas, or their private and political friends, and, except in some allusions to the East and to the glories of Caesar, a collection of poems dedicated by Horace to Maecenas would be much the same whether issued in 19 or 21. But if Horace was a lyrical *poet* at all, if the *Odes* were meant to reach the feelings of the patron, the persons addressed, or the general reader, the question ‘before or after the year 22?’ goes to the essence of his work. To say nothing of his feelings as a man, or of the profound change, which, as so intimate a friend must have known, the tragedy of that year had made in the position of the minister—the political attitude taken by the poet is such that, writing or publishing after the conspiracy, he could not ignore it. Horace was, as he constantly reminds us, one of the converts to imperialism and the party of Augustus, a section of society probably very large, and certainly by wealth and position very important. He had fought for the republic, and grows enthusiastic over the pleasure of meeting his old companions in arms. In the brief biography of him which has come down to us, one of the chief facts is that so far from courting the emperor, he showed in the face of persistent advances a coldness, which Augustus was inclined to resent even in so pronounced a political supporter. This behaviour is of course perfectly intelligible. The conviction of the judgment does not bind the feelings, and Horace would have been less than a man if he could have forgotten whose victory it was which reduced him, and doubtless many a friend who had not his power of recovery, to the state of misery and disappointment described in his own vivid phrase as

¹ A summary of the arguments generally used will be found in Wickham’s edition of the *Odes*, Introduction to Books I.—III. See also the notes of

all the editors, especially on i. 3, ii. 9, ii. 10, and iii. 19.

² See on ii. 19. 20.

‘the grovelling of a bird whose wings are lopped’ (*decisis humilem pennis*). It has often been observed¹ that, with all the imperialism of the poet, it is not to the active servants of the emperor that his Muse addresses herself. There are no odes to Antistius, or Carisius, or Vinicius, or Aelius Gallus², or any of the men whom history shows us to have been trusted with military employment at the time when the Odes were in writing. Agrippa himself, a sort of second emperor, receives nothing but rather transparent excuses. Sestius, the devotee of regicides, Corvinus, under whom the partizans of Brutus rallied after Philippi, Pollio, the declared enemy of monarchical principles, Plancus, one of the worst and last deserters of Antonius, Dellius, the deserter of every one—it is to these and their like that Horace speaks. Now the narrative above given from Dion Cassius shows what effect was produced by the event of 22 upon the relation of the government to these great persons and their numerous compeers of less distinction. A premature reconciliation was followed by an aggravated return of hatred, suspicion, and fear. That some whom the government could not or would not detect were more or less guilty of the conspiracy is probable; and certain that all the party, in whose supposed interest it was undertaken and who resented the manner in which it was put down, must have felt that the mark of it was upon them. Conscious innocence even was a small consolation, for many did not believe in the guilt of Murena. The society which furnished the most eminent readers of Horace was thus completely changed by this first assassination-plot against the established empire, and in short, everything was changed which much concerns the interpretation of Horace, if he is to be taken seriously,—the dedicator and the receiver of the dedication, the friendly circle and the outer public.

I will now state briefly the evidence for the date of the Three Books as it stands at present upon the authorities known to me. At first sight it seems a simple matter. Indications of date would naturally be looked for in parts of the work having a general relation to the whole, such as the commencement and the

¹ e.g. by Dean Merivale.

² Dion 23, 25, 26, 29.

conclusion¹. The preface to the *Odes*, though in a stricter sense comprised in the first poem, in a larger sense extends to the first three, which are devoted, with obvious intention, to the patron, to the monarch, who could not be further postponed, and to the primate of literature. The third, on Vergil, seems to be precisely dated; Vergil has started for Athens and not yet arrived, which gives, if we refer to the only voyage of Vergil known to us, a date early in B.C. 19.² It is unnecessary to dwell at present upon the proofs by which this fair *prima facie* evidence is supported; I will mention only one, not for its special force, but because I do not happen to have seen any notice of it. Among the first words of the book is the reference, not very complimentary when read with its context, to the competition for the magistracies of the republic, the triple grade of aedile, praetor, and consul,

terrarum dominos evehit ad deos,
hunc si mobilium turba Quiritium
certat tergemini tollere honoribus.³

Comparing this with the plain depreciation in

virtus...nec sumit aut ponit secures
arbitrio popularis aurae,

the tone becomes yet more noticeable. Now we know the preface is commonly the last part of a book to receive its final form. If the *Odes* were finished in 20—19, this reference to the rivalries of popular election has point; at any time between 30 and 22 it would have been, for an imperialist, extremely maladroit. During that period there were no real elections to the consulate at all; the emperor was returned every year, and the other candidates whom he “recommended” seem to have

¹ Compare the note of date at the end of the first book of the *Epistles*.

² Of course this evidence is not conclusive; it may be explained away as it has been, by supposing an earlier voyage. I hope to show that so far as it points to a date after 22 it only reinforces what may be superabundantly proved from elsewhere. If

Horace wrote and arranged as we have them *Od.* iii. 4 and *Od.* iii. 5 at any time before the year 22, he was an inspired prophet.

³ The dispute as to the punctuation of this passage is not here material. I do not mean to imply any judgment upon it.

obtained their places as a matter of course. At all events the consular elections obtain no notice from our historian. The populace, as already observed, was more than contented, and cared nothing for aristocratic ambitions, and the *ἔμφορες*, 'the sensible party',—so Dion significantly calls the acquiescent section of the upper classes—desired nothing less, as they soon afterwards proved, than a return to the gladiatorial canvasses of the late republic. For what purpose could an *ἔμφορον*, an imperialist, like Horace, put thus prominently forward what seemed to be so happily tending to oblivion? But in 22—from what cause is not very clear but partly it would appear from the refusal of Augustus to accept office—the character of the elections suddenly changed. (The mere absence of the emperor is an insufficient explanation, as this occurred also in 27—24.) However, for the next few years the city was threatened with a resurrection of Catiline and Milo. The struggle for the place which Augustus declined was so violent that until late in the year 21 there was but one consul¹. Two years after, the process was repeated, this time with bloodshed². Meanwhile the danger of these contests to the emperor was illustrated by the career of the senator Egnatius. By spending his money freely on popular objects he had previously become aedile and praetor, and 'had the audacity' to be a candidate for the consulship for 19 when Augustus refused it. He was disappointed by the firmness of Sentius, sole consul in the interim, and justified the fears of the imperialists by forming a plot to assassinate the emperor on his return³. Writing amid all this, Horace might well choose

¹ Dion 54. 6.

² *id.* 54. 10.

³ Vell. 2. 91, neque multo post (i.e. *after the conspiracy of Murena*) Egnatius collecto in aedilitate favore populi in tantum quidem, ut ei praeturam continuarent, mox etiam consulatum petere ausus.—92, florentem favore publico sperantemque ut praeturam aedilitati, ita consulatum praeturae se iuncturum. There is some uncertainty as to the date of Egnatius' aedileship

and praetorship, which he obtained contrary to law in successive years. Dion (53. 24) places the aedileship in 26; but if this is right the language of Velleius is not at all natural; taken by itself it would certainly suggest that the aedileship and praetorship were in 21 and 20 respectively—dates much more probable on general grounds than those of Dion. As to his candidature for the consulship and conspiracy there is no question.

as one type of ambition with which to contrast his own harmless pursuits

hunc, si mobilium turba Quiritum
certat *tergeminis* tollere honoribus;

indeed the emphasis twice laid by Velleius on the alarming rapidity with which Egnatius mounted from grade to grade, shows that the reference could scarcely miss the advantage of a personal application.

But against this, and much more which will be said in favour of the date furnished by the ode on Vergil, it is urged that we have conclusive evidence of publication before B.C. 22 in the odes on Murena. That these were *written* before the conspiracy is assumed, so far as I know, universally, and is indeed certain, *if they have been correctly explained*. According to the current views of III. 19, there is nothing to distinguish the party there represented from any other assembly of friends. They are dining and drinking as other joyous parties drink and dine. Murena happens to be one of the company, and for some reason, perhaps his promotion to the augurate, his health is proposed. That *this* was not composed after his execution, needs no proof. But some go further than this—with good reason surely—and argue that it cannot have been *published* afterwards². Yet upon no reasonable hypothesis, not to speak of evidence, can the publication of III. 19 be separated from that of the whole collection. Of some poems, such as I. 37, it might be conjectured, if there were any reason, that being of public interest they were too widely known to be suppressed when the collection was formed. In this case nothing of the kind is probable. Moreover the figure of Murena is not essential to the picture; a few slight changes would, if the poem is what it is supposed to be, have

¹ It is worth notice that Velleius in praising Sentius for the suppression of Egnatius uses language strongly recalling Hor. Od. III. 24. 31 (*naturaliter audita visis laudamus libentius et praesentia invidia praeterita veneratione prosequimur*;) and draws a parallel

between Sentius and the *veteres consules*. The significance of this will be seen hereafter.

² Mr. Wickham (see his Introduction to Bks I.—III.) is a representative of this view.

preserved everything material. The allusions, considering to whom the poems are dedicated, can be called nothing else than brutal.

To me the argument that III. 19 as generally explained cannot have been published, or republished as part of the collection, after B.C. 22, and the argument from I. 3 and other evidence that the whole collection, as we have it, cannot have been published before B.C. 19 seem both unanswerable, and the conclusion to which the two arguments point is that III. 19 is not correctly explained.

For the difficulty lies not in the fact of the allusion to Murena, but in the tone of it. That Horace, writing or publishing after the conspiracy, would pass the history of Murena in silence can in no way be presumed. As a poet, indeed, he could ill afford to do so. A theme more suggestive for poetry of a tragic cast, especially as the ancients conceived of tragedy, it would be difficult to imagine. The whole story from prologue to catastrophe—the hard lessons of experience learnt and forgotten, the humiliation, the sudden rise and ill-sustained prosperity, the insolent tongue which made enemies when it was the time to propitiate envy, the doubtful guilt and certain ruin, the wide-spread sympathy not unmixed with horror—all that our authorities give us unites in a subject such as Aeschylus chose, a veritable *τραγῳδία* of real life, acted not in the theatre of Dionysus but in the midst of the society of Rome. Nor would the relation between the poet and Maecenas forbid the subject, if only it were touched in a proper spirit. What was the private opinion of Maecenas on Murena's crime and the emperor's justice, it would be vain to conjecture. But on no view could he desire silence. On the worst construction—and Maecenas must have known the worst more intimately than the judges themselves—or on the best, the minister's friends could not do him greater service than to mark the contrast between his loyal modesty and the treason or madness at least of his brother-in-law. In such problems of conduct, one example is worth much speculation; and though fortunately it is not easy to illustrate from our own history the conditions of a

dangerous court, we may find a parallel near enough for the purpose. The court of the Tudors was more dangerous than that of Augustus, and the position of Maecenas after the conspiracy of Murena has some resemblance to that of the Duke of Norfolk, also eminent in the service of the government, who had the misfortune to be nearly connected with both the convicted wives of Henry VIII. Would a man of letters attached to the Duke have thought the fate of Anne Boleyn and Catherine Howard a theme prohibited? Certainly not, seeing that the Duke himself, in an address to the King and on other public occasions, openly testified his shame and disgust. In truth, if there are topics too delicate for speech, there are also topics too delicate for silence, and for the 'graves principum amicitiae' other affections must pay. And certainly Horace, whatever he said of Murena by name, uses language pointing to him with a directness, which makes the want of the name a truly nominal omission. Let us turn a few pages from Murena's banquet and look at III. 24—

O quisquis volet impias
caedes et rabiem tollere civicam,
si quaeret PATER URBIVM
subscribi statuis, indomitam audeat
refrenare licentiam,
clarus postgenitis: quatenus—heu nefas!—
virtutem incolumem odimus,
sublatam ex oculis quaerimus invidi.
quid tristes querimoniae,
si non supplicio culpa reciditur? etc.

Even if we had not positive evidence for placing the final arrangement of these poems in the year 19, the bearing of this passage could scarcely be mistaken. We have already seen how the absence of Augustus from the summer of 22 to the summer of 19 was distinguished from the years preceding by the 'rabies civica', the 'caedes', and the 'indomita licentia' against which the poet exclaims. When the emperor at the entreaty of the 'moderates' had turned back to end the tumult, the air was full of conspiracies, real or supposed. The many trials and executions which followed were witnessed in Rome with the

same mixed feelings which attended that of Murena, though the extraordinary examples mentioned by the historian upon the first occasion do not recur, and it may be supposed that the tragedy lost force by repetition¹. When Horace bids the emperor—for the address of the apostrophe is obvious—not to shrink from the hatred provoked by just punishment but look to posterity, he could scarcely put more plainly the advice to send the imitators of Caepio (and Murena?) where he had sent their predecessors². Equally clear is the expostulation with the half-hearted imperialists who wanted order without severity—‘What profits sour complaining, if punishment cut not the root of crime?’—and the significance of the title *Pater Urbium*. The generality of *cities* does not conceal *the* City, the *Patria*³, and the reward of courageous severity is to be the designation bestowed by ‘enslaved’ Rome upon Julius, by the ‘free’ senate upon Cicero,—a telling rebuke to those nobles who murmured against Augustus for following the example of the suppressor of the Catilinarians rather than that of their advocate, and forgot, in compassion for a L. Murena executed after trial in their own time, that their fathers had voted, at the instance of the L. Murena before him, for executing persons dangerous to the public peace without any trial at all!

We have now to see whether it is possible to find an interpretation for the poems on Murena more consistent than the current one with the date and general spirit of the book. For certain reasons it will be best to risk the temporary inconvenience of taking our first point almost at the end of the story⁴.

Quantum distet ab Inacho
 Codrus pro patria non timidus mori
 narras et genus Aeaci
 et pugnata sacro bella sub Ilio;
 quo Chium pretio cadum
 mercemur, quis aquam temperet ignibus,

¹ Dion. 54. 15.

² The natural association of these events comes out well in Velleius 2. 93, ‘ante triennium fere, quam Egnatianum

scelus crumperet, circa Murenæ Cæpionisque coniurationis tempus.’

³ See Wickham and others *ad loc.*

⁴ III. 19.

quo prae-bente domum et quota
 Paelignis caream frigoris, taces.
 da lunae propere novae,
 da noctis mediae, da, puer, auguris
 Murenae. Tribus aut novem
 miscentur cyathis pocula commodis;
 qui Musas amat in-pares,
 ternos ter cyathos attonitus petet
 vates; tres prohibet supra
 rixarum metuens tangere Gratia
 nudis iuncta sororibus—
 Insanire iuvat: cur Berecynthiae
 cessant flamina tibiae?
 cur pendet tacita fistula cum lyra?
 parcentes ego dexteras
 odi; sparge rosas; audiat invidus
 dementem strepitum Lycus,
 et vicina seni non habilis Lyco.
 spissa te nitidum coma,
 puro te similem, Telephe, vespero
 tempestiva petit Rhode;
 me lentus Glycerae torret amor meae.

It has been truly said that this banquet scene is distinguished among the odes by its gaiety. For 'gaiety' say 'wild extravagance' and the distinction will be truer still. *Sparge rosas*, says the speaker. Has it ever occurred to the reader to ask himself what it would cost to obey this order? The season is extremely cold, so cold that it is a comfort to escape into the house¹. Of the place we will say nothing at present. Let it be Rome. Where were these 'roses' to come from? With all the diffused luxury and art of our own times it would take money to provide any great quantity of flowers in such weather at Rome or elsewhere. In the time of Horace, flowers, except such as came naturally, were the privilege of the few. *Like a hyacinth in the rich man's parterre* is the bride in Catullus². *His zeal rivalled the wealth of princes*, says Vergil, of the old veteran who, upon a poor bit of ground, made

¹ I do not insist on the suggestion of some that *nova luna* (v.g.) is the *νομήνια*, the first day of the year, though it is very likely right.

² talis in vario solet
 divitis domini hortulo
 stare flos hyacinthinus

poppies, roses and lilies grow among his vegetables¹. To have a garden was indeed within moderate aspiration², and the garden provided not only the vegetables, but the chaplets, which were also part of a fairly appointed feast. When roses could be had, so much the better for the festivity, but these were for ordinary people a summer luxury. Horace, though he calls himself 'a poor man' in comparison with the great lords who dined and corresponded with him³, was in easy circumstances. Writing to Maecenas in the very height of summer⁴ to invite him from Rome to the country, he reminds him that the roses have long been ready for his wreath⁵. But in the middle of April, even for so great an occasion as Maecenas' birthday, 'more sacred almost than his own', he can offer only ivy and 'apium'. How could it be otherwise? Artificial horticulture was in its beginning. As late as the next reign the forcing of vegetables under cover was a noticeable feature in the imperial gardens. The taste for such luxuries was indeed growing fast, watched, like other forms of unproductive expenditure, with jealousy and some indignation by a government which had hard work to meet public needs. Vergil in the few lines which he gives to the art, is careful to note that the ground in which his industrious peasant grew flowers was a waste bit with which nothing more profitable could be done. In the same spirit Horace, as the roses grow scarce, tells his servant that myrtle will do very well, and sneers at the passion for 'Persicos apparatus⁶'. But the taste grew in spite of sneers and rebukes⁷; and it is quite possible that already cultivated flowers could be got during most of the year, as they may be now—by paying for them. In the preparation made for celebrating Numida's return,—the coarsest scene, by the way, in the *Odes*, and the only one except that which we are discussing which can be described as an orgy—it is directed that along with the incense and the victim 'lilies and roses shall not be wanting,'⁸ which as there

¹ regum æquabat opes animis.

Georg. iv. 132.

² Hor. Sat. ii. 6. 2.

³ Od. ii. 18. 10.

⁴ Od. iii. 29. 16.

⁵ *ib.* 3.

⁶ Verg. Georg. iv. 116 foll. Hor. Od. i. 38.

⁷ Od. iii. 15. 5.

⁸ Od. i. 36. 15.

is no note of season, may be taken to imply that such adornments were generally procurable. But long after this, when peace and the progress of wealth had made flowers and other desirable things more common than they were in Horace's time, the rose remained the symbol and accompaniment of luxury. In Juvenal (XI. 122) roses are still counted among the pleasures of the rich, and it is the reproach of the satirist that the rose itself has ceased to satisfy. Even in Martial modesty flies at the coming of 'wine and roses'. Among the outrageous entertainments which Nero demanded from his 'friends' is mentioned a *cena rosaria*, said to have cost upwards of £30,000¹.

Upon any reasonable estimate then of habits and resources in the Augustan age, roses in a season of 'Paelignian cold' must have been as noticeable as a rare orchid now. To provide chaplets of them would have been magnificence. To throw them about is—what the speaker in Horace implies that it is, deliberate madness, the act of one whom *insanire iuvat*, revelling in the mere pride of waste². Then the music—why will the guests have the 'Berecyntian' music? The instruments of Cybele were not commonly thought good for the wits. 'Silence the wild cymbal' is the prayer of sense³, 'and the Berecyntian horns, which bring after them blind Self-love, and Boastfulness with empty head too high, and Confidence, transparent more than glass, that lets the hoarded secret fly.' The only motive alleged for the 'frantic din', except the resolve to play the fool, is the desire to give provocation, innocent possibly, but not very safe. And the musical provision, like the floral, is remarkable not in quality only, but in scale. The Romans played and sang after dining, but to have a band was no commoner then

¹ That the roses of this feast, whatever else may have been done with them, were in part for wreaths, is shown by the parallel between the *rosaria* and the *mitellita*. Suet. Ner. 27.

² It may be noticed that to scatter flowers at private feasts was no ordinary custom at all. No one does so, I believe, in Horace except the lover who

woos Pyrrha 'multa in rosa', scarcely a type of reason; and that is at a time of year when a 'grotto' is 'pleasant'. The special arrangements for scattering flowers at the banquet are mentioned among the luxuries of Nero's *Golden House*, Suet. Ner. 31.

³ I. 18. 13.

than it is now. The companions of Murena have better music, or at least more, than seemed enough for a state banquet in honour of the greatest victories¹. Even the friends of Numida, are content with 'strings'²; elsewhere Horace, with all his lyrics tell of feasting, notices no music more complicated than a song to the single harp. The concert in IV. 1. 21,—which is precisely the same as that of Murena, even to the 'Berecynthia tibia'³;—is not for a dinner but for the ritual of a temple. Certainly Murena has a gay party. It is a pity, however, that their mirth is not more harmless. To bring out fully the effect of the concluding sentences would be to anticipate⁴, but this may be said here, that the wanton disturbance and hint of mischief conveyed in the lines,

audiat invidus
dementem strepitum Lycus
et vicina seni non habilis Lyco,

is quite out of harmony with the tone of the Three Books and must be intended to displease.

It will be noticed that the speaker propounds two alternative canons for drinking, recommended, he says, respectively by the number of the Muses or of the Graces⁵. The rule of the Graces is best for peaceable men, but the decision (*insanire iuvat*) is evidently for the deeper potation. Now though Horace once, upon a festal occasion such as could scarcely recur in a life-time, announces his intention fairly to lose his wits⁶, sobriety is his common text⁷. And that there may be no mistake about his meaning here, this nocturnal orgy, which contains *no reference to Horace nor any hint that he is of the party*, has near it the companion picture of a festive night at the poet's own house.

¹ Epod. ix. 5.

² I. 36. 1.

³ *lyraeque et Berecynthiae
delectabere tibiae
mixtis carminibus non sine fistula.*

⁴ See *Venus and Myrtale*.

⁵ It is not necessary to discuss whether the nine and the three *cyathi* are varying proportions of wine to

water (in a total of twelve *cyathi*) or measures of the size of the cups, 'bumpers of nine' and 'bumpers of three.' I take the last view, for a defence of which see Mr. Page's note on the passage.

⁶ II. 7. 26.

⁷ I. 17. 22, I. 18. 6, I. 20. 1, I. 27. 3. etc.

Even in the pleasure of a visit from Messala, it is not forgotten that there is danger in the wine, and the Graces, rejected in III. 19, are carefully mentioned in III. 21 among the patrons of the expected feast—

te Liber, et (si laeta aderit) Venus
segnesque nodum solvere Gratiae
viviaeque producent lucernae,
dum rediens fugat astra Phoebus¹.

It is now time to inquire under what circumstances this most noticeable entertainment takes place, and what is the supposed scene of the poem. The current explanation is as follows. The scene is Rome, the expression 'Paelignian cold' being merely proverbial or poetic for intense cold. Some one somewhere is talking archaeology, when the speaker bids him dismiss such topics and consider the arrangements for a joint banquet in the evening, for which one shall furnish the house and the warm water (for the bath, or for mixing with the wine, or both), while wine, and presumably the other necessities, shall be bought at the joint expense or by the banqueters severally². Then, 'φαντασίας οπε', he suddenly shifts to the midnight hour and the actual banqueting, and imagines himself proposing a toast to 'Murena the augur', from which it is conjectured that the improvised festival may be intended to celebrate his admission to the college.

Now I will say nothing as to the artistic effect of the supposed change of scene, or the probability of it in a poem of this length and character. There is no other such in Horace³; why it has been so generally agreed to assume it here is plain enough—if the party is already at table, the question what they pay for their wine is not much more to the purpose of drinking and

¹ III. 21. 3, 23. It is worth while to compare the two poems.

² Macleane almost alone, I think, among recent commentators rejects the notion of an *ἔπανος*, but, as he follows the usual view that the banquet is prospective, I cannot understand upon what other supposition he explains

the situation at all. Do the party mean to impose themselves upon some one entertainer?

³ II. 7. and II. 11. are cited, but the analogy, if any, is very imperfect. Indeed it is not clear that there is any change of scene there at all.

hilarity than the question how far the date of Inachus is from the date of Codrus. Nor shall it be objected, though it is true, that the feast by contribution (*συμβολή*) was a Greek custom rather than a Roman¹. This apart, it still appears that the above explanation cannot be right.

For what is meant by saying that after the second stanza the scene changes? On this point there is much obscurity in the language of the commentators, and well may be. From some we might gather that there is a real interval of time, in which the arrangements are completed, the party assembles, half the banquet elapses and midnight arrives. If so, the poem is no poem at all, but two fragments, and would be rather more intelligible if so printed. But probably the meaning of all is that clearly expressed by Orelli, that the speaker projects himself *in imagination* only into the midst of the banquet. If so, since the choice of a house to meet in is still an open question, how can the speaker possibly forecast the character of the neighbours? What reason is there in the assumption that an old gentleman and a lady too young for him will be within hearing? Then see the style,—the dramatic points *da lunae novae, sparge rosas, te petit Rhode* etc. Is it possible that all this is mere anticipation of what is going to be said some hours later? Then again, if the poem does not begin at table, to give the rebukes addressed to Telephus any point, it has to be assumed that he is ‘master of the feast’², or something of the kind, a fact which, if required, ought to be given and not left to obscure inference. The more we examine the case the more it will appear that the two first stanzas, as commonly explained, are worse than useless. The poem falls into pieces without junction, and we must endorse, in a sense not intended by the critic, the judgment that Horace has here been specially successful in ‘concealing his art’.³

¹ In Greek plays translated into Latin the ‘symbola’ appears with the other Greek features; but so far as I can discover Roman literature proper exhibits neither the word nor the thing.

² Orelli and others. I say ‘to Telephus’, but the antiquary who is in-

terrupted may or may not be identical with Telephus.

³ There is one technical objection to the current view scarcely worth mention after such as are stated above, though to my own mind almost conclusive *per se*. A sentence such as *quo*

Upon the difficulty of supposing that the scene throughout is the banquet itself, it is needless to say more at present, than that this view seems to have been almost universally rejected. The objection, fatal certainly at first sight, lies, as already said, in the words, *quo Chium pretio cadum mercemur*; but for these words the interpretation now popular would perhaps never have been thought of. It is this which suggests the notion of the 'symbola', and gives what plausibility it has to the assumption of a change of scene.

But now—to consider the poem without prejudice—there are one or two reasons for thinking that, instead of a breach between the second stanza and the third, we ought to find a close connexion. 'You discuss remote dates,' says the speaker, 'and tell stories of ancient heroes; of a time and person which more concern me you say nothing, and that is the hour at which and the man by whose hospitality I escape the bitter cold. Come, a bumper to midnight and another to Murena!' So far there is connexion enough. Certain topics are marked as relevant to the occasion and a toast is given to each. The host is described doubly as provider of the house and the fire, because shelter and warmth are the comforts in season¹. If there were nothing to guide us but the correspondence of *quota hora* to *noctis mediae*, it would be a noticeable hint. But for the correspondence between *Murena* and *quo praebeante domum* there is independent evidence. The words *praebeante domum*, not a common phrase, are repeated from an earlier work, and are there joined with the name of Murena². If the name and

pretio mercemur taces is, taken by itself, ambiguous between the two meanings *you do not say at what price we buy* and *you do not say at what price we are to buy*. But the choice is no longer indifferent, when the sentence stands in sharp antithesis to another of the same form, *quantum distet, narras*. Surely the natural impression must be that the correspondence of form answers to a correspondence of meaning, and that, as *distet*

is an actual and not a deliberative present tense, *mercemur*, *temperet*, and *caream* are the same.

¹ Whether the warm water was for bathing or drinking or both signifies little, but I believe the tradition of the scholiasts (followed by Ritter) is right; it is the banquet only which is in view, and the water therefore is for the table.

² Sat. i. 5. 38. *Murena praebeante domum*.

phrase are not connected here, it was an odd trick of recollection that brought them together. And this analogy may help us further. The house which Murena 'provides' in the *Satires* is a country-house, and the expression is more suitable to the country, where in default of such provision lodging comfortable for winter was scarcely to be had, than to Rome. It is said that in *Paelignis frigoribus* the epithet must be qualifying merely. How should it be? We are offered the illustration 'Siberian cold', a good instance of a local epithet used to mark a quality, and aptly showing why *Paelignis* should not be so interpreted here. Local names have *prima facie* a local meaning, and if they are to have any other, the literal sense should be excluded by the circumstances. For the names of very remote places the remoteness itself provides the condition, and as an Englishman might write 'Siberian cold' so Horace writes *Sithonia nive*, and might have written *Getica frigora*, or perhaps *Alpina frigora*, without risking any ambiguous suggestion that the scene of his poem was laid in Scythia or on the Helvetian border. But the country of Sulmo and Corfinium was no savage desert. Even 'Paeligna', or to come nearer still, 'Praenestina', would have done well enough, if the scene were otherwise fixed at Rome. But *Paelignis frigoribus* is the sole note of place in the poem. Why should it not be literal? The heir of the great Varro not only may but must have had property in the region of Paelignian cold, for close to the Paelignian hills lay Reate, the seat of Varro's family, the place where he was born and from which he is denominated *Reatinus*. Reate was not a Paelignian town, but a Roman visiting it in a severe winter might well call the cold 'Paelignian', as an Englishman visiting Thun in such weather would consider the climate 'Alpine', though Thun is not in the Alps.¹

So far, then, all fits the supposition that this is no *symbola*, but a festive supper in a house of Murena's at or near Reate in the Sabine uplands. But again we are brought up against the old barrier of *quo Chium pretio cadum mercemur?*—which is

¹ The valley of Reate was itself *Dict. of Geography*, Art. 'Reate'. celebrated for its coolness. See Smith's

indeed darker than ever, for the guests of an augur certainly did not purchase their wine. Not literally, doubtless, and for cash, but 'to purchase your wine' had more meanings than one in Roman language. It was permissible and graceful for an invited guest, unless the host were very rich, to bring as a gift some contribution to the elegancies of the feast, for example, a delicate unguent or perfume. Catullus jests on the custom, by writing an invitation, in which he offers perfume if the guest will bring the rest of the entertainment¹. Horace refers to it in iv. 12, where he invites a mercantile money-making friend, and pointedly reminds him that a poor man's wine is not to be had for nothing, so he must bring his box of ointment—

sed pressum Calibus ducere Liberum
 si gestis, iuvenum nobilium cliens,
 nardo vina merebere.
 nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum
 qui nunc Sulpiciis accubat horreis,
 spes donare novas largus amaraque
 curarum eluere efficax.
 ad quae si properas gaudia, cum tua
 velox merce veni: non ego te meis
 immunem meditor tingere poculis,
 plena dives ut in domo².

The language of this passage is curiously exact in its resemblance to *quo Chium pretio cadum mercemur*, and shows, I think, that if Murena's visitors earned their entertainment by bringing some valuable return, this would satisfy the words as well as if they had paid him in cash³. Perfumes indeed would not have been a present worth so much notice for a man whose servants were scattering roses in winter. But a title, a decoration, or an appointment (the augurate itself, for example) might be worth the wine even of a great nobleman; and any such

¹ Cat. xiii.

² Possibly in r. 31. 10, dives et aureis mercator exsiccet culullis vina Syra reparata merce, the last words *wines bartered against Syrian wares*, i.e. exchanged for perfumes, refer to this social 'commerce,' rather than the literal. The guests commonly lost

nothing, being paid in ἀποφόρητα, the presents of the host.

³ It was a feast day, moreover, the Kalends, perhaps the *nova luna* (νοῦνηλια) specially so called, the first of the year and the day for giving *strenæ* (étrennes), additional reasons why they should not be *immunes*.

gifts of imperial favour Murena's visitors might very well bring him, in the shape of an announcement, from Rome. The puzzle is that, according to the speaker, they seem to have brought the *nova luna* itself. The correspondence already noticed between the toasts of the third stanza and the questions of the second requires us to find a relation between *quo Chium pretio cadum mercemur* and *da lunae propere novae*. The gift, the host, and the hour are the three topics of question; the hour and the host being accounted for in the two last toasts, we are left with the *luna nova* for the *pretium*; and indeed from the prominence given to these points, they ought to be the chief in the situation. Here, to my mind, is the difficulty that must be faced.

One view, which has occurred to me as conceivable, is given below¹, with my reasons for not thinking it satisfactory. The solution which I am going to offer is bolder, but I venture to think that it is complete. The *luna nova* here mentioned ought to be something which could be brought as a gift. Is this really impossible? Not at all. The principal care of Augustus, during the earlier part of his sole rule, was the constitution of society upon the new monarchical base, and in particular the purging and limitation of 'the orders', the senate and the 'equites', both of

¹ We might solve, or rather avoid, the difficulty by combining *da lunae novae* and *da noctis mediae* as a joint answer to the question *quota hora*, the hour indicated being the commencement of the first day of the month (or year). The gift which is brought or announced we might suppose to be the *auguratus* (indicated by the title *auguris*) dating from the Kalends (*nova luna*, *νοῦνη*), an appropriate day of commencement. The party having sat up till midnight, the speaker suddenly remembers the time and calls for a health to the host in his new dignity. And this, so far as it explains the emphasis laid upon the day and time, is probably true; the

dignity, whatever it was, commenced with the new month. But, in my opinion, this is not all that the passage requires. The comparison between what the visitors bring to Murena and a feast-gift, such as the box of ointment in iv. 12, would scarcely suggest itself naturally, unless some *material object* were in view, having more visible relation to the banquet than a mere announcement by word, letter, diploma, or whatever the form might be. Now the *auguratus* had a material emblem, the wand or *lituus*, like the "White Staff" of the Lord Chamberlain in former days. But this is not meant, or it would be mentioned.

which, especially the senate, had suffered severely in twenty years of civil war from impoverishment, unworthy promotions, and other causes of degradation¹. The transition of the senate from the governing aristocracy of a republic to the peerage of a monarchy was a process of much purgation. One thorough revision was among the first acts of the new government after the overthrow of Antonius and Cleopatra. Another followed upon the return of the emperor from the settlement of the East, which occupied the year 20-19. In 22 was tried without much success the experiment of appointing censors after the old republican kind. Minor occasions of admission or exclusion are repeatedly mentioned by historians; and among the inventions of the emperor, Suetonius names two boards charged with the revision of the lists from time to time as occasion should arise². With these changes in the composition and status of the orders was proceeding a more general change, characteristic of a monarchical revolution, the increasing importance of personal decorations, shown by the fact that after the foundation of the empire, *insignia*, military and civil, soon became separable from functions, so that the 'ornaments' of the consulate, prætorship, triumph, and so forth, became, like the corresponding realities, objects of sovereign grant, not less sought and more readily bestowed³. Of civil *insignia* few were more splendid than the senatorial, the marks of peerage in the new society; and under the empire, whatever may have been the case previously, the peculiar badge of the senate was the so-called *luna*, the crescent of ivory upon the shoe⁴. What was the political origin of this decoration and when it was first recognized by law is an obscure point. Like all Roman institutions, the imperial no less than the republican, it was provided

¹ Suet. *Aug.* 35, 38. It is useless to accumulate passages on a subject which in Dion Cassius runs through the whole history of this reign. It has been already noticed that it had a financial as well as social importance. The authorities for the rest of the paragraph will be found in the ordinary books of reference.

² *triumviratum legendi senatus et al-*

terum recognoscendi turmas equitum quotienscumque opus esset. Suet. *Aug.* 37.

³ Among examples of such separations may be noted that of the senatorial *insignia* by Augustus, introduced to diminish the invidiousness of revision. Suet. *Aug.* 35.

⁴ Compare the 'star' of a modern order.

with a fabulous derivation, being traced *e. g.* from the Arcadians, presumably through the companions of Evander, who came even before Aeneas to Rome¹. As a symbol of long descent (from the proverbial antiquity of the moon or otherwise) it may really have been known from early times, though there is no proof of the fact. Shoes of a particular form and colour were among the marks of senatorial rank under the republic. Cicero alludes to them, and Horace in the *Satires*; Cato discusses their origin. In imperial times the *luna* also is frequently mentioned as a senatorial emblem², but not apparently earlier, and we shall presently see that the only *political* explanation of it known to Plutarch is purely imperial. Probably, like other details of official costume, it was an ancient but uncertain custom to which the social punctilio of the reforming monarchy gave new fixity and significance.

The event then which I conceive to be celebrated in this poem is the reception or re-assumption by Murena of this decoration. The event itself is no matter of conjecture. A man who 'lost his property in the civil war' did not, we may safely assume, obtain a place in the first reformed senate of the year 29, the very object of the reform being to get rid of poverty and disaffection. On the other hand, it has been shown that Murena was a senator and pushing his way to prominence in the year 22. We may perhaps gather from the poem that his admission coincided with the conferring of the augurate. Murena is represented at the height of his suddenly recovered prosperity—and in what company? Drunkenness, prodigality, wantonness, and mischief, the 'insane' luxury, unwholesome for body and mind, against which the readers of the *Odes* are so often warned, are the features of Murena's banquet.

sapienter idem
contrahes vento nimium secundo
turgida vela,

is the advice given to Murena when his prosperity is still in the

¹ Plutarch, presently cited.

² *e.g.* Stat. *Silv.* v. 2. 27—28 *sic te, clare puer, genitum sibi curia sensit primaque patricia clausit vestigia luna.*

See Mayor on Juvenal vii. 192, upon whose references, the fullest collection I can find, I here depend.

future, and here is the result. Here is the temper in which men listen to evil suggestions, when they blurt the thought which should lie safe, when the head reels to the maddening Phrygian pipe,

cum fas atque nefas exiguo fine libidum
discernunt avidi¹.

Here is the behaviour which makes a man odious and lays up jealousy and enmity against the day of need.

And there is a special circumstance not to be passed over. The discourse so rudely interrupted may not be agreeable to the company, but there had been those who would have found it more interesting than women or wine. The question of the distance in date between Inachus and Codrus was, according to the science of the time, of no small importance. The date of Inachus was the initial era of Greek history². The date of Codrus, last Athenian king, was the initial era of republican Athens. A few years before this banquet, a scholar from Rome entertained at Reate by the greatest historian and antiquary of the day, who fixed the 'Varronian era' of the 'regifuge' from which we still measure the years of republican Rome, might have talked even till midnight on the dates of Inachus and Codrus without fear of being interrupted by toasts and scandal. So also the toper's appeal to the number of the Nine recalls the law laid down by the great scholar in the interest of good conversation, 'that the guests should be not more than the Muses nor fewer than the Graces.' In suggesting this contrast Horace is following a great example. This was not the first time that Varro's apartments had been strangely occupied. Years before, during the first civil war, his villa at Cassinum had been seized for a time by Antonius. No reader of Cicero will forget the passage in which the revels of the marauder are compared with the grave and dignified hospitalities of the owner—

"Studiorum enim suorum M. Varro voluit esse illud, non

¹ I. 18. 10. See the whole passage.

² Ἀργείου προσεκτέον. Ocellus Lucanus,
cited by Orelli *ad loc.*

² τοῖς λέγουσι τὴν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς
ιστορίας ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ Ἰνάχου εἶναι τοῦ

libidinum deversorium; quae in illa villa antea dicebantur? quae cogitabantur? quae literis mandabantur? iura populi Romani, monumenta maiorum, omnis sapientiae ratio omnisque doctrinae. At vero, te inquilino (non enim domino) personabant omnia vocibus ebriorum; natabant pavimenta vino; madebant parietes; ingenui pueri cum meretricibus, scorta inter matres familias versabantur¹.

Horace has of course drawn his picture in brighter colours; his Murena is a thoughtless fool, not a thief and a villain; still the contrast is the same in spirit.

So much on the meaning of the poem taken by itself. But it is not an independent unit, and cannot be fully appreciated except in connexion with the series through which the story is told. This commences of course with II. 10, the greater part of which has been already quoted. It purports to be addressed to Murena in the time of his disgrace and poverty (*v.* 16, we shall see in another essay that this fits with the place of the poem in the collection) and to give hopes of better fortune hereafter. The form of the promise is highly significant—

informes hiemes reducit
Iupiter, idem
submovet;...quondam cithara tacentem
suscitat musam neque semper arcum
tendit Apollo.

Even before Actium the connexion was notorious between the future Augustus and Apollo. Jupiter and Apollo were his deities, but above all Apollo. His more superstitious admirers believed him to be the god's own son²; his detractors made epigrams on his pretensions to the Apolline character, which he was even said to have acted at a certain famous dinner *en masque*³. After the victory won beneath the temple and in sight as it were of the patron⁴, it naturally became an article of

¹ Something answering *mutatis mutandis* to the last words is probably indicated in the close of Horace's poem, but not knowing the persons we cannot appreciate it. When Horace published, the whole scene and company was probably as well known as the supper

when 'the rotten orange was squeezed' to a Londoner under William III.

² Suet. *Aug.* 94. Dion. 45. 1. His mother is given as the authority!

³ Suet. *Aug.* 70.

⁴ Verg. *Aen.* 8. 704. Actius haec cernens arcum intendebat Apollo.

faith that it was Apollo who 'laid aside the lyre and assumed the bow' to subdue the enemies of Caesar and Rome—

adstitit Augusti puppim super, et nova flamma
luxit in obliquum ter sinuata facem.
non ille attulerat crines in colla solutos,
aut testudineae carmen inerme lyrae ;
sed quali adspexit Pelopeum Agamemnona voltu,
egessitque avidis Dorica castra rogis....
dixerat et pharetrae pondus consumit in arcus ;...
bella satis cecini : citharam iam poscit Apollo
victor et ad placidos exiit arma choros¹.

Consequently, to remind one who had lost that the bow may again be relaxed and the lyre touched is to open the prospect of reconciliation with the victor. For the rest, Horace argues equally against undue depression and (with a view to the possible future) undue elation—on this much more than enough, if the poem were really what it pretends to be. It is scarcely kind to urge on one whose state is 'at present ill,' that 'he who loves the golden mean...provokes not jealous eyes with a palace.' However, when Murena next appears, the improbable palace has become a reality.

The poems we have been noticing (II. 10, and III. 19) are the only two which introduce Murena by name. But in II. 18 we come upon a very curious fact, the explanation of which is closely connected with our subject. The poem is as follows :—

Non ebur neque aureum
mea renidet in domo lacunar,
non trabes Hymettiae
premunt columnas ultima recisas
Africa, neque Attali
ignotus heres regiam occupavi,
nec Laconicas mihi
trahunt honestae purpuras clientae.
at fides et ingeni
benigna venast, pauperemque dives
me petit : nihil supra
deos lacesso nec potentem amicum
largiora flagito,

¹ Propert. v. 6. 29. foll. Whether this image of the lyre and bow was a commonplace of the time or whether

the analogy between Horace and Propertius has a more direct cause it is unnecessary to enquire.

satis beatus unicus Sabinis.
 Truditur dies die,
 novaeque pergunt interire lunae :
 tu secunda marmora
 locas sub ipsum funus et sepulcri
 inmemor struis domos,
 marisque Baiis obstrepentis urgues
 submovere litora,
 parum locuples continente ripa.
 quid quod usque proximos
 revellis agri terminos et ultra
 limites clientium
 salis avarus? pellitur paternos
 in sinu ferens deos
 et uxor et vir sordidosque natos.
 nulla certior tamen
 rapacis Orci fine destinata
 aula divitem manet
 erum. quid ultra tendis? aequa tellus
 pauperi recluditur
 regumque pueris, nec satelles Orci
 callidum Promethea
 revexit auro captus. hic superbum
 Tantalum atque Tantalii
 genus coerceat, hic levare functum
 pauperem laboribus
 vocatus atque non vocatus audit.

This poem, differing in this respect from II. 10 and III. 19, is one of those which contains references to facts in the life of Horace, showing that the poet, in his historic character, is the speaker (see the allusion to Maecenas' gift of the Sabine farm in *v.* 14). If we compare other such odes in the Three Books we shall find that they have another, and very natural, characteristic in common; they are addressed, if to any one, to historical persons¹. Now this also purports to be addressed to

¹ This is one of the most curious of the many differences between the original collection and the "fourth book". The odes of the collection, which contain (1) autobiographical references and also (2) an address, are I. 1, I. 20, II. 12, II. 17, II. 20, III. 8, III. 16, III. 29 (all addressed to Maecenas), I. 3 (in effect to Vergil), I. 6 (to Agrippa), I. 7, see *v.*

13 (to Plancus), I. 33 (to Tibullus); II. 6 (to Septimius), II. 7 (to Pompeius), II. 16 (to Pompeius Grosphus), III. 21 (to Messala Corvinus, practically, though in form to the wine-bottle). All these persons, except Septimius and Pompeius (II. 6 and 7), are known to be real from external evidence, and these two by the poems themselves.

somebody (*v.* 17), but this somebody, by an exception unique in poems of this type, *receives no name, real or fictitious*. Equally remarkable is the earnest tone of expostulation in which the poet speaks. Nowhere else do we find extravagance and luxury assailed in this personal form. Where Horace is most severe—in II. 15, for example, or III. 6, or III. 24—he is most general, avoiding both reference to himself and all forms of direct address to individuals. Where these are used, as in I. 18, II. 2, II. 16, the sermon is pitched in a lower key, and so arranged as to prevent any direct application of the moral. Personal remonstrances, if we except the half-playful poem to Iccius upon his projected ‘invasion’ of the East (I. 29), are reserved for an imaginary ‘Asterie’ (III. 7) or the wife of an imaginary ‘Ibycus’ (III. 15), and the poet is careful not to prompt suspicion by identifying the preacher with himself¹. Observing thus the natural dictates of good taste, he cannot have been unaware that here on the contrary he had so expressed himself as to force the question, ‘To whom does Horace address these warm and familiar rebukes?’ Nor has he omitted the answer. What he says of himself in the first fourteen lines is obviously to be understood by contraries of the unknown: the antithesis is the scope of the poem, enforced by the emphatic *mea, mihi, me, tu*. Horace has *no* golden roof and marble columns; ‘Tu’ builds incessantly, invading the sea and, what is worse, expelling the poor to enlarge the ‘palace’, which after all he must quit for the tomb. Horace has *not* entered suddenly upon a princely residence by the bequest of a stranger. ‘Tu’ then has; and

Some of the personal odes have, of course, no address at all, as I. 31 and 32, II. 13. None of those addressed to persons certainly or possibly fictitious have any ‘personal’ touches (I. 17 not excepted; see the Essay *Venus and Myrtale*). The way in which IV. 11 combines a date in the life of Horace and Maecenas with an invitation to ‘Phyllis’, is peculiar to the supplement and connected with a very interesting subject

to be discussed hereafter. See the same Essay.

¹ In the *Epodes* of course all these conditions are reversed, personality being the essence of the style. It is worth notice that the ‘Hipponactean’ metre of II. 18, unique in Horace, by its very name and history suggested a personal meaning. In ancient literature the form is far more important than with us.

this in itself is evidence that 'Tu' is no mere 'dives aliquis', but ascertainable. Originals answering such a description must in any society be so few that to rebuke them as a class would be to court an offensive misapplication. Now whoever else there may have been in Rome who might be fixed on as 'ignotus heres Attali', there was one whom enquiry could scarcely miss, and that was the successor of M. Varro. The 'Attalus' of the parallel is, as every one knows, the Pergamene Attalus Philometor, who bequeathed his kingdom to the distant Republic. Any king of that book-buying dynasty, from whose capital 'parchment' is called to this day, might have furnished a fit type for the great librarian and land-owner, whose distinctions were immense wealth and yet more prodigious scholarship. But between Philometor and Varro there is a much closer analogy.

The writings of Varro were for the most part such as 'the general reader' is content to admire from the outside. Philology and antiquities, though they had relatively more students than now, were specialties even in Rome, and the style of Varro is no lighter than his themes. Agriculture and gardening were topics for everybody, and after the completion of the *Georgics* (circ. B.C. 28) might be said for the moment to take literary precedence of all others. Varro's 'standard work' on these arts, which preceded Vergil's poem by a few years¹, and furnished in part the material for it, is fairly readable. At the time when Varro died, both books were fresh in interest, and all who knew more of him than that he was very rich and very learned must have known him as the author of the treatise *De Re Rustica*. In the first chapter of it the author gives a list of previous writers on the same subject, and almost at the head of this, in consideration perhaps of date and rank as much as merit, stands the very Attalus Philometor of Horace's allusion². Under these circumstances, if this severe address to the 'heres Attali' had not been intended for the successor to Varro's wandering

¹ Written when the author was eighty, i.e. about B.C. 36.

² Hi sunt quos tu habere in consilio

poteris, cum quid consulere voles;
Hieron Siculus et Attalus Philometor
etc. Varr. *De R. R.* I. 1.

wealth, that successor might, I think, most justly have resented the equivocation¹.

It is therefore not surprising that this ode connects itself both with II. 10 and III. 19. As to the first, the whole is but an expansion under altered circumstances of the lines from II. 10 above translated,

auream quisquis mediocritatem
diligit,...caret *invidenda*
sobrius *aula*².

The '*invidia*' in the picture of the poor dependants turned out of home for the patron's needless pleasure is patent to a modern reader, perhaps never more than at this present time³; but a still more effective touch to a contemporary would be the description of the palace itself in the first few lines. The use of gold in the decoration of private houses was of quite recent introduction, and gave great offence to the Puritan sobriety which was still in the Roman character. But a very short time before, the application of gilding to the roof of the national sanctuary itself had seemed in doubtful taste⁴. Lucretius, in a passage which Horace has remembered several times, inveighs against the desire for such ornaments⁵, and Seneca in turn satirizes it in language which recalls more than one expression

¹ Many of the notes on Odes II. 18. 5 and I. 1. 12 say that the use of the names 'Attalus', 'Attalicus', is proverbial for wealth. The point is not important, but it is perhaps worth while to remark that the texts are no proof of this. It seems just as likely that I. 1. 12 is explained by some story unknown. After Horace, a proverbial use is found, naturally enough.

² Cf. II. 18. 31. I think these are the only two places where the *Odes* have *aula* in this sense.

³ July, 1884. Note also the epithet in *honestae clientae*.

⁴ Plin. *H. N.* 33. 18, 'laquearia, quae nunc et in privatis domibus auro teguntur...nam sua aetas (B.C. 60)

varie de Catulo existimavit, quod tegulas aereas Capitolio inaurasset primus.' This and the reference to Seneca I take from Smith *Dict. Ant.* on *Domus*, that to Lucr. from Orelli on Hor. *Od.* II. 18. 1.

⁵ Lucr. II. 14 foll. Cf. *ib.* 29—33 with Hor. *Od.* II. 3. 13 and II. 11. 13, Lucr. *ib.* 20—21, 34—35, with Hor. *Od.* III. 1. 41—48, Lucr. *ib.* 37—39 with Hor. *Od.* II. 16. 9 foll. The emphasis laid by Lucretius on the fact that flowers are a natural luxury of certain seasons (32—33) throws light upon Murena's winter roses. Indeed the whole passage is the very moral of the Three Books and should be read in this connexion.

of Horace¹. A still better commentary is furnished by an epigram of Martial. The career of Murena through extravagance and outrage to a tragic end was repeated, on a scale suitable to the march of the times and the difference between a sovereign and a subject, by the emperor Nero. The 'golden house', which was among the chief causes of his ruin², is the subject of the second epigram '*de Spectaculis*'³. Martial is pointing to the various buildings which afterwards stood on the enormous site—

hic ubi sidereus propior videt astra colossus,
et crescunt media pegmata celsa via,
invidiosa feri radiabant atria regis,
unaque iam tota stabat in urbe domus.
hic ubi conspicui venerabilis amphitheatri
erigitur moles, stagna Neronis erant.
hic ubi miramur, velocia munera, thermas
abstulerat miseris tecta superbus ager.
Claudia diffusas ubi porticus explicat umbras
ultima pars aulae deficientis erant.

The touches here collected from Horace, and especially from II. 10 and II. 18, are highly significant as showing how the older poet was understood by the later. The central figure which gives interest to Martial's epigram is notorious to the world; the poems of Horace are strung upon a thread of semi-public history long since broken, whose fragments cost patience to unite. More important even than II. 10 to II. 18 is II. 18 itself to III. 19. (The story of Murena is by no means neglected in the interval, but we will postpone the side-allusions at present)—

da lunae propere novae,
da noctis mediae, da, puer, auguris
Murenæ,

cries the boon-companion feasting in the senator's luxurious

¹ Sen. *Ep.* 90, 'Philosophia hæc cum tanto habitantium periculo imminetia tecta suspendit? Parum enim erat fortuitis tegi! culmus liberos texit etc.' (Cf. Hor. *Od.* II. 15. 17, nec fortuitum spernere caespitem leges sinebant.) Hor. *Od.* II. 2 refers also

chiefly to such applications of the precious metals, as the word *lamina* (*foil* for plating) shows.

² Suet. *Nero*, 31.

³ Cited by Orelli on *Od.* II. 10, 5--8, see also III. 1. 45. The reminiscences from II. 18, 23--36 are equally plain.

house. Compare this with the prophetic menace of the counsellor—

truditur dies die,
 novaeque pergunt interire lunae :
 tu secunda marmora
 locas sub ipsum funus et sepulcri
 immemor struis domos.

Where is the wisdom of the *augur*¹, who in the pride of his new bauble, and among the flowers upon his floor, forgets that

non semper idem floribus est honor
 vernis neque uno luna rubens nitet
 vultu²;

that the ‘*nimum brevis rosa*’ is but the emblem of man’s mortality³, and that ‘new moons go forward to their waning’?

The notion of a moral significance in the badge of nobility is probably with Horace a mere poetic imagination, but it became in a more prosaic age the serious opinion of antiquaries. “Why”, asks Plutarch in his ‘Enquiries respecting Rome’, “why do those who pretend to the distinction of nobility wear the little moons upon their shoes? Is it, as Castor tells us, a token that they dwell, as the saying is, upon the moon, and hereafter when they are dead their souls shall have the moon beneath their feet? Or was it a privilege of the oldest (Romans), who were Evander’s Arcadians and called from his time *προσέληνοι*? Or is this, like many other things, a reminder to the proud and exalted that man is liable to decline as well as to rise, an example from the moon, which

*Unseen before comes first into the new,
 Still facing fairer to the round and full,
 And presently when noblest of aspect
 Dwindles again away and comes to nought!*

Or was it a lesson of obedience, not to be rebellious in council; but, as the moon consents to regard her superior and be second to him,

¹ It will hardly be necessary to remind the reader that the ‘unconscious irony’ of this *auguris*, and the use of the ‘mantic’ art for such a purpose is

an exact imitation of Athenian tragedy.

² II. 11. 9.

³ II. 3. 14.

ever with eye upon the sonne beam,

as Parmenides says, so to be content with the second place, consulting their 'princeps' and enjoying the power and honour from him derived¹?"

If Plutarch had written this passage expressly as a commentary on the connexion between the words of Horace, it could not have been more exactly to the point; indeed the verbal correspondences are almost beyond accident, and though we cannot trace the stages of the process, it is likely enough that Plutarch's ethic actually is Horace's poetry, condensed in the colder air of speculation. We have seen that Horace claims for his *Odes* a wreath from the Muse of tragedy², and now the claim is perhaps intelligible. To my mind at least the 'irony' of that brilliant midnight might not have misbeseemed Sophocles himself. The pause in the wild music is a last chance, the 'silent lyre' an unheeded warning³. *I hate the hand that spares; scatter the roses*, cries the tipsy reveller,—his name we do not know, but some among the first readers of Horace doubtless knew it well enough. How would the noble host have received this sentiment on another day, when the 'red right-hand' of the avenger⁴ would not spare for any imploring; and nothing

¹ Plut. *Quæst. Rom.* 76, Διὰ τί τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὑποδήμασι σεληνίδας οἱ διαφέρειν δοκοῦντες εὐγενεῖα φοροῦσιν; πότερον, ὥς Κάστωρ φησί, σύμβολόν ἐστι τοῦτο τῆς λεγομένης οἰκήσεως ἐπὶ τῆς σελήνης, καὶ ὅτι μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν αὐθις αἱ ψυχαὶ τὴν σελήνην ὑπὸ πόδας ξέουσιν; ἢ τοῖς παλαιστοῖς τοῦτο ὑπῆρχεν ἐξαίρετον; οὗτοι δ' ἦσαν Ἀρκάδες τῶν ἀπὸ Εὐάνδρου προσεληνῶν λεγομένων. ἢ, καθάπερ ἄλλα πολλὰ καὶ τοῦτο τοὺς ἐπαιρομένους καὶ μέγα φρονούντας ὑπομνήσκει τῆς ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων μεταβολῆς, παραδείγμα ποιουμένους τὴν σελήνην

ὡς ἐξ ἀδήλου πρῶτον ἔρχεται νέα, πρόσωπα καλλύνουσα καὶ πληρουμένη, χῶταν περ αὐθις εὐγενεστάτη φάνη πάλιν διαρρεῖ καὶ μὴδὲν ἔρχεται; ἢ πειθαρχίας ἣν μάθημα, βουλευομένων

μὴ δυσχεραίνειν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἡ σελήνη προσέχειν ἐθέλει τῷ κρείττονι καὶ δευτερεύειν, αἰὲ παπταίνουσα πρὸς αὐγὰς ἡελίοιο, κατὰ τὸν Παρμενίδην, οὕτω τὴν δευτέραν τάξιν ἀγαπᾶν, χρωμένους τῷ ἡγεμόνι καὶ τῆς ἀπ' ἐκείνου δυνάμεως καὶ τιμῆς ἀπολαύοντας.

The reading βουλευομένων has been suspected, but is right as a neuter genitive absolute, lit. 'when things are debated'; the reference is of course to the βουλὴ or γερουσία (senatus). For εὐγενεστάτη in the citation from tragedy some read εὐφανεστάτη; the original may have run so but εὐγενεστάτη suits Plutarch's purpose.

² III. 30. 16; see Essay I.

³ Contrast II. 10. 18.

⁴ I. 2. 2; cf. I. 3. 38—40.

was before him but the dishonoured grave, on which only by connivance might the customary roses be strewn¹?

The peculiar form of II. 18, an address nameless and yet apparently personal, has thus an obvious reason. That poem fills in the story the place of the friendly but solemn warning which only infatuation will disregard. A real speaker is necessary to the effect, nor could the poet venture to assign such a part to another. Yet to bring himself and the unfortunate man into the same picture was a delicate matter, and he solves the difficulty by avoiding the name and substituting an enigma which those who would might solve and the indifferent pass by. In such commonplace as II. 18, the identity of the speaker signifies nothing; here therefore (and of course in III. 19) 'Horace' is absent and Murena can be named without reserve.

On the climax of the tragedy the catastrophe follows quick. It has already been noticed that in III. 24 we have what may be called an address of the 'moderates' to the throne upon the events of the years 22—19, calling upon the emperor not to shrink from the severities which public order required². The poem sums up the political moral of the Three Books, tracing license to its cause in luxury, bidding the rich devote their gold to the public service or—throw it away, and calling for a sterner training of the young to give the future a better chance. The language is for the most part general, and contains no personal invocation more explicit than the oblique reference to Augustus

¹ Lavishness in flowers was with the Romans, as it has lately become with us, a tribute to the dead (Verg. *Aen.* vi. 813—6, *purpureos spargam flores*, etc.), and in the summer tombs were decorated at a special 'feast of roses' (*rosales escae*). When flowers could not be procured, leaves were used, as Horace reminds us in the verse immediately preceding III. 19, *spargit agrestes tibi silva frondes*; the wintry forest strews its leaves as if in honour of the dead year, the Italian *Faunus* here absorbing the symbolism of Pan.

It is worth notice that Vergil's "swain Daphnis" (Julius Caesar?) is made to "enjoin" the simpler observance in his own case, his will being signified by the disappearance of flowers after his death,

pro molli viola, pro purpureo narcisso
carduus et spinis surgit paliurus acutis;
spargite humum foliis, inducite fontibus
umbras,
pastores; mandat fieri sibi talia Daphnis.
et tumulum facite, etc.

(*Ecl.* 5. 37.)

² III. 24. 25 foll.

already cited. But Latin, which sometimes expresses by the second person the indefinite 'one', is well adapted for covert allusion in seeming generality, and by a single touch of this kind Horace has combined his wider moral with his particular illustration.

Intactis opulentior
thesauris Arabum et divitis Indiae
caementis licet occupes
terrenum omne tuis et mare publicum¹,
si figit adamantinos
summis verticibus dira Necessitas
clavos, non animum metu
non mortis laqueis expedit caput.

So the poem begins; here the quasi-personal form is dismissed. In these two stanzas is the last appearance of the extravagant builder, rebuked generally in many parts of the *Odes*, and individually in II. 18. When we have observed that the *laqueus* was the instrument of *execution*, we shall be near to guessing what memory has guided the metaphor.

In the three poems devoted to Murena and in the final allusion just noticed the story itself is concluded. But if we would fully understand the relation between this story and the *Odes*, we must look more widely. For example—in various parts of the poems on public history and politics the myths relating to the defeat and punishment of rebels against the gods,—the Giants, Prometheus, Tantalus &c.—are used to typify the contemporary struggle of order against anarchy, Jupiter typifying the emperor and the cause of Rome, his enemies the contrary forces over which they prevailed. Thus the sins of the civil wars in general are likened to those which drew down the ancient flood (I. 2), and in the triumphal ode (I. 12) which seems to connect itself with the defeat of Sextus Pompeius and the revindication of the sea, the gods of the 'Gigantomachia' are selected to receive the thanks of the state². After what we have seen, it would be rather a surprise to miss in the *Odes* some parallel between these types of hostility to the policy and

¹ So Lachmann (followed by Munro). reading here.

It would be out of place to discuss the

² I. 12, 13—22. See Essay III.

person of Augustus and the accomplices of Caepio, the more so when we find a like parallel explicitly drawn by Ovid. When Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses*, weary of the Giants and their imitators, announces to the assistant gods his detection of the conspiracy of *Lycaon* and his intention to inflict a terrible punishment, the council was moved, says Ovid, like the world applauding the discovery of a plot against the life of the emperor :

confreuere omnes; studiisque ardentibus ausum
talia deposcunt. sic, cum manus impia saevit
sanguine Caesareo Romanum exstinguere nomen,
attonitum tanto subitae terrore ruinae
humanum genus est, totusque perhorruit orbis.
nec tibi grata minus pietas, Auguste, tuorum,
quam fuit illa Iovi¹.

Now in one of the odes (III. 4) the battle of the Titans fills a large space. The poem is notorious for a difficult transition of thought, but the explanation lies in the events of the years 25—22. From the beginning to v. 37 the subject is the gratitude of Horace to the Muses for protecting his life in the past and his confidence in their guardianship for the future ;

vester, Camenae, vester in arduos
tollor Sabinos, seu mihi frigidum
Praeneste, seu Tibur supinum
seu liquidae placuere Baiae, etc.

From v. 42 to the end the subject is the overthrow of the Titans and other offenders against the gods. The transition is managed thus—

vos Caesarem altum, militia simul
fessas cohortes abdidit oppidis
finire quaerentem labores
Pierio recreatis antro.
vos lene consilium et datis et dato
gaudetis almae.—Scimus ut impios
Titanas immanemque turmam
fulmine sustulerit caduco
qui terram inertem qui mare temperat, etc.

Let us recall briefly the history. In 25 Augustus was danger-

¹ Ov. *Met.* i. 199.

ously ill at Tarraco; during his illness his lieutenants finished (for this time) the Cantabrian war and subdued the Salassi of the Graian Alps; both conquests were followed by the foundation of colonies for the veterans, Augusta Praetorianorum (Aosta) and Augusta Emerita (Merida), the name of the Spanish foundation indicating, as said above, the feeling of the emperor that his *military* career was at an end. Under the care of his physician Antonius Musa he recovered and returned to Rome in 24. Early in 23 he had a yet more severe illness and made preparations for death. Musa however was again successful and received enormous rewards from the public gratitude. In the autumn of the same year Marcellus, in spite of Musa, died at Baiae, and the conspiracy of Caepio and Murena followed within a few months¹. It would be impossible to put a 'learned' allusion to these events, in the style which the Roman poets borrowed from Alexandria, and which plays so large a part in works like Vergil's *Eclogues*, more neatly than Horace has done it. The Muses were the patrons of the healing art², as of all the arts, and especially favourable it might be supposed to their namesake—if indeed his remarkable name was not rather due to his skill. In a single stanza Horace combines with it the foundation of the two cities, with their names, Augusta Praetorianorum (*cohortes*) and Augusta Emerita (*Caesarem altum finire quaerentem labores*), and finally the 'Pierian cave', with its memories of the Thessalian Chiron, teacher of Aesculapius, and the mythical beginnings of medicine³. The Muses saved the life of Horace and the life of Augustus, "Ye give the (physician's) soothing counsel, and rejoice in the gift. ('Sed erant qui felicissimum statum odissent.' Woe to those who rejoiced not!) We know how Jove's thunderbolt destroyed the unduteous Titans,"—and so we pass to the conspirators⁴. (For all

¹ See Dion Cassius for these years. Velleius (II. 93) places the death of Marcellus 'about the time of the conspiracy of Caepio', so that the interval cannot have been great. Dion shows only that the conspiracy was early in 22.

² Carm. Sacc. 62.

³ Pind. *Pyth.* III. 1. *Nem.* III. 53, *Χείρων τράφε λιθίνῳ ἔνδον τέγει Ἀσκληπίον τὸν φαρμάκων ἐδίδαξε νόμον*, etc.

⁴ Franke and those who follow him in dating the *Odes* before 23 regard the reference to conspiracy here as mere vague anticipation (or connect it with

this the way was prepared, in the thoughts of the writer at all events, by the stanza first cited; for his journeys between 'soft Baiae' and 'cold Praeneste' were in fact regulated by the prescriptions of Musa, who was celebrated for a cold treatment, sent his patients to cold resorts, and of Baiae in particular had a very natural fear¹).

In the Titanomachia itself there are details worth note.

the very unsuitable history of Cornelius Gallus). What is written above will show, I hope, that the allusions are not vague; a prophecy (in a sense) they are, but a prophecy written, as might be supposed, and as the next Ode proves, *after the event*.

¹ Hor. *Epist.* i. 15. 2. The silence of Horace on the failure of 'the Muses' in the fatal autumn of 23 is here easily understood. I take this opportunity of touching on the absence from the *Odes* of any reference to the death of Marcellus. From this, and the occurrence of the name in i. 12. 46 it has been argued that the *Odes* were completed before 23. Of course, if this Essay has any meaning, this is no more possible than that *Samson Agonistes*, for example, was published before the Restoration or the *Divina Commedia* before the exile of Dante. Assuming the later date, is there anything surprising in the treatment of Marcellus? As for the supposed difficulty of i. 12. 46, I confess that I can see nothing in it. It is an allusion of the vaguest kind. Among names and families great in Roman history occurs that of Marcellus: the *direct* reference is not to the young heir, but to his great ancestors, especially the victor of Syracuse. Cf. Prop. iv. 18. 33 and see Plüss, *Hor. Stud.* p. 106. No doubt the juxtaposition of the names *Marcellus* and *Iulius* has significance, but the *ostensible* date of the poem is long before the death. See Essay III. In a poem on the prospects of Rome, as-

suming to date from that time, some notice of the heir was almost necessary; the lighter the touch the better, and Horace's touch is the lightest possible. Why the subject is not taken up again, why there is in Book III. no 'dirge', such as Mr Wickham thinks might be expected from the author of i. 24, is a more interesting question, but, like most literary questions of this negative kind, it admits no certain answer. Perhaps the simplest and truest would be that Horace did not think he could do better than Vergil and Propertius, and did not care to do worse. And another consideration—Vergil was, certainly after 29, the personal friend and intimate of the imperial family; Propertius had at least no Philippi in his past; Horace, it must be again observed, rather avoided the friendship of Augustus, even when (*after the Odes* and first book of *Epistles*) it was almost forced upon him; and lived in connexion with a party whose devotion to the emperor (so far as it existed) was purely political. Before 19 Marcellus' place had been supplied, in the political sense, by the birth of Augustus' grandson. Under all these circumstances, a 'golden silence' is far from inexplicable. And on the other hand, we might surely ask with at least equal force, how, if the *Odes* were published at a time when Marcellus was 'the Cynosure' of every eye—how it is that the allusion of i. 12. 46 is all that Horace gives him?

sed quid Typhoeus et validus Mimas,
aut quid minaci Porphyryon statu,
quid Rhoetus evolsisque truncis
Enceladus iaculator audax
contra sonantem Palladis aegida
possent ruentes? hinc avidus stetit
Volcanus, hinc matrona Juno et
nunquam umeris positurus arcum
qui rore puro Castaliae lavit
crines solutos, qui Lyciae tenet
dumeta natalemque silvam
Deliuss et Patareus Apollo.

It need not be supposed that every name in this list has a historical analogue. Personal touches there probably are, though as we know not even the names of any of the accused, except Caepio and Murena, we cannot recognize them¹. But the victors, the imperial family, we do know, and there is an unmistakeable point in the prominence given to Apollo. By the year 22 age and dignity had converted Apollo-Octavianus into Jupiter-Augustus, but Tiberius, the actual prosecutor of the conspirators, made in some respects even a better Apollo than his step-father. A prince who wore his hair long and was something of a poet² could scarcely escape the comparison, which was a topic of jest in the family itself. 'Vale, iucundissime Tiberi,' writes Augustus to him, 'et feliciter rem gere, ἐμοὶ καὶ ταῖς Μούσαις ἡδίστε στρατηγῶν'.³ Critics have objected to the description 'nunquam umeris positurus arcum', that it does not suit the moment of battle. If we compare it with the promise to Murena in II. 10. 19, which like the rest of the poem is not only a promise but a warning, we shall see that it is adapted not to the parable, but to the interpretation. Speaking *as if* before 22, Horace reminds the disaffected that though Apollo is not always *bending* his bow, yet from his shoulders he will never lay it. Let none

¹ Perhaps some confusion arising from this parallel helped to produce the strange reading of the MSS. in Suet. *Aug.* 67, *Licinium Enceladum*. The passage refers, however, to the emperor's freedmen, and has been corrected to *Licinium et Celadum*.

² Suet. *Tib.* 68, 70.

³ *ib.* 21. The text is very slightly corrupted, the best MS. giving ΜΟΥΣΑΙΣ ΔΙΣΤΕ ΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ (see ed. Roth., Teubner series, *Praef.* p. xli). The allusion is obviously to Apollo as Μουσῶν ἡγῆτωρ or Μουσαγέτης.

presume rashly upon his peaceful mien¹. If we add that at the time when the *Odes* were being completed, this vindicator of his father's majesty actually was in the neighbourhood of his Delian and Lycian homes², we must admit that here also is an allegory which it would have taxed the Alexandrines to surpass³. The other figures, having no special relation to the conspiracy, are less conspicuous; it is enough that the celestial group selected, in its relations to the monarch,—daughter, wife and two sons—answers precisely to the imperial, as it stood in the year 22 and then only, Augustus, Julia, Livia, Tiberius and Drusus. Before 22 some representative must have been found for Marcellus; after 22 Julia must have brought in Agrippa, and to compare her to Pallas would have been absurd. To fix the reference still more clearly the next Ode commences with

Caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem
regnare; praesens divus habebitur
Augustus adiectis Britannis
imperio gravibusque Persis.

Of the two future tasks here indicated, the subjugation of the West and East, it is the last which occupies the poem; the subject being the shame of Crassus' defeat and the degradation of his army. Let us now go back to history. Upon or shortly after the suppression of Caepio, the emperor dedicated the temple of *Jupiter Tonans*, a votive offering for a narrow escape from a thunderstorm in Spain⁴. Dion, always

¹ Compare the description of Bacchus in the allusions to the *Gigantomachia* II. 19. 21—28, and for the historical situation Dion 54. 3.

² He was on his way back from his expedition or demonstration against the Parthians, and came *via* Rhodes. Dion 54. 8, 9. Suet. *Tib.* 11.

³ Some light may perhaps be thrown by the above upon the question respecting the conclusion of the poem *vv.* 69—80. The last stanza and the last but one introduce rather abruptly examples of the dangers of *lust*. It has been suggested (see Page *ad loc.*)

that they are pointed at M. Antonius, which is possible; but from Caepio back to Antonius is a long spring. It is perhaps more likely that there is some allusion to supposed projects on the part of the conspirators with respect to Julia, who became disposable by the death of Marcellus. Those who have suspected interpolation will of course have an obvious explanation, for the *later* conspiracies (of Iulus Antonius, etc.) were certainly connected with the 'amores' of Julia.

⁴ Dion 54. 4. Suet. *Aug.* 29.

careful of religion, faithfully records that at the dedication there was actually thunder. Upon such an occasion of thanksgiving the quite recent escape could scarcely be forgotten; in Horace at all events the parallel between the Thunderer and his servant on earth, immediately following the allegory of the Titans slain 'by the bolt ever ready to fall', suggests the connexion in a manner not to be mistaken. After this rite followed almost immediately the departure of Augustus for the visitation of the East, the object and termination of which was the recovery of the lost standards of Carrhae¹. The complaints of many critics against the abruptness of the transition from faith in the Thunderer to the ignominy of the 'miles Crassi', might have been modified had they observed that the thoughts of the poet are following in outline the events of the past.

The poems addressed to Murena contain no allusion to the defeat of the Titans. In the admonition of II. 18 he is bidden remember the fate not of Rhoetus, but of Tantalus and Prometheus, punished both of them for insolence against Jove and grouped together in the poet's vision of Hell². Both, as compared with the Titans, are enigmatic characters. Tantalus had been the entertainer of the gods, but was brought to destruction through ill digesting his prosperity, to use the metaphor of Pindar³. As to Prometheus, it is to be remembered, that though Titan-born, he did not espouse the Titan cause; on the contrary, some of the legends attributed to him a chief part in the victory of Jove⁴. All this we should probably understand better if we could recover the curious book of Maecenas "*qui dicitur Prometheus*", an invaluable commentary, to judge from the quotation in Seneca, both on the *Odes* and on the story of Murena.

The remembrance of it brings us aptly to our next

¹ Dion 54. 6.

² II. 13. 37.

³ Pind. *Ol.* I. 54 foll. Cf. *Od.* I. 28. 7, *conviva deorum*; *Ov. Met.* I. 165, *Lycaoniae convivia mensae*; *ib.* 198, *struxerit insidias notus feritate Lycaon*. It is possible that the emperor either was present or was to have been present

at the banquet celebrated in III. 19.

⁴ Aesch. *Prom. Vinc.* 197 foll. In that play of course Prometheus is the hero, and many parts of the story do not agree with the common mythical view of his character. But he is always regarded as an exception among the Titans in having originally sided with Zeus.

question—the relation between the *Odes*, the conspiracy, and Maecenas, to whom the collection is dedicated. Upon the probabilities of the situation something was said above; it is now to be seen whether the poems themselves correspond. The picture of Murena seems to answer precisely the minister's presumable wishes. Horace paints him as proud, extravagant, wilful, culpably careless in offending public opinion and private feelings, and above all *deaf to friendly advice*. The description answers to history and was probably true in fact; it is at all events to the advantage of Maecenas, and under the circumstances very far from injurious to the dead. That the judges had convicted him of treason was undeniable; the contention of his friends was, as Dion shows, that the evidence would not have been thought sufficient, but for the prejudice and enmity caused by the previous behaviour of the accused. To emphasize, therefore, the unpopular traits in his character, is to diminish the weight of the criminal charge. And the tragic turn given to the story by the poet, the elation of sudden prosperity followed by a terrible fall, appeals forcibly to the element of compassion in the mixed feelings which the historian represents. On the other hand Horace is eloquent in expressing his horror of the conspiracy and satisfaction at the punishment of the impious. Whether Murena was one of the impious, he of course does not and dared not pronounce. He ventures only parallels, which while they admit, what was notorious, that the emperor had received great personal provocation, at the same time suggest that, with regard to the actual treason, the sentence of the judges might have misdirected his wrath. For the rest, in contrast to the inordinate pride and offensive display, which on the milder interpretation had cost Murena his life, the *moderation* of Maecenas is set in the strongest light. The climax of Murena's dangerous elevation is represented, as we have seen, by his senatorial 'peerage'; on the other hand Horace insists on the fact that Maecenas remained an *eques*, declining the distinction which, it is assumed, he could have commanded¹. This com-

¹ It is clear from Velleius ii. 83 that this 'moderation' did not escape satirical remarks. See p. 25.

mentation has been often noticed, but not so, perhaps, the extraordinary energy of feeling with which it is expressed—

crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam
maiorumque fames. iure perhorruī
late conspicuum tollere verticem,
Maecenas, equitum decus.

‘*I have been right to shrink*’ is not the language of commonplace. A few lines earlier we read

concidit auguris
Argivi domus ob lucrum
demersa exitio¹.

The professed comparison is between the humility of Horace and the greatness of Maecenas, but the contrast between Maecenas and one for whom the *equester ordo* was not high enough is also implied, and the person, if there were any doubt, sufficiently designated. Of the seven poems addressed to the patron, four represent him as not disdaining in his greatness to share the sober feasts and simple pleasures of Horace²—a topic of consolation as well as of praise. The most important of all, not only by its length but by its position at the close of the book, is III. 29, in form a suggestion to Maecenas to take the season of summer for a visit to the Sabine farm. Taken in connexion with the data of history, it shows plainly what was the real position of Maecenas at the time when the collection took shape. We have seen what was the effect on his position of the conspiracy of 22. Ostensible change there was none; occupying no legal office, he had no dismissal to undergo, and remained in outward view as before, the representative in the capital of Augustus’ personal interest, till the creation of the *praefectus urbis* in the year 16. On the other hand, the inner relations between him and the emperor were gravely disturbed, and his position as counsellor damaged so that it was never entirely restored. The poem reflects both conditions. In III. 8 (another invitation to Maecenas, the allusions of which

¹ III. 16. 11 foll. For *perhorrescere* cf. II. 15. 15, where it describes the fear of known danger which arises from

experience.

² I. 20, III. 8 (note vv. 15, 16), III. 16, III. 29.

connect it with a date at all events before 22¹) he is thus addressed—

mitte civiles super urbe curas ;
occidit Daci Cotisonis agmen,
Medus infestus sibi luctuosus
dissidet armis etc.²

In this concluding poem Horace is careful to use precisely similar language—

tu civitatem quis deceat status
curas et urbi sollicitus times
quid Seres et regnata Cyro
Bactra parent Tanaisque discors.

But if we look to the whole drift, it is plain enough that this minister is not 'incolumis'. The terrible uncertainty of human happiness, swept away suddenly as by a flood, the virtue of remembering that *past happiness* cannot be undone, and, *if Fortune shifts her favours*, taking the loss calmly in *the consciousness of innocence*—these are the topics upon which Horace insists, and however edifying such a sermon might be to a statesman in the height of his power, it is not then that he commonly hears it³. Of course, the advice and consolation is put in the form of commonplace, and refers nominally only to the poet's own principles, but, apart from the insipidity of such generalities if they had no interest to the person addressed,

¹ See next Essay.

² It is disputed whether *civiles* here means *internal, domestic*, as opposed to *foreign*, and so is a repetition of *super urbe*, or simply *statesman-like* (see notes *ad loc.*). But I do not think either gives the true or at least the whole point of *civiles*. In the language of the republic, *civilis* meant 'consistent with the proper relation of citizens' and corresponded most nearly to our word 'constitutional'. Now the appointment of an imperial officer legally charged with the government of the city, in fact a *praefectus urbis*, was intensely repugnant to republican feel-

ing. The first person selected for the office (Messala Corvinus), resigned it almost immediately on the express ground that it was an '*incivilis potentia*'. By describing Maecenas' position, which was, or rather had been, a sort of '*praefectura urbis*' without the name, as '*civiles super urbe curae*', Horace at once softens the expression to republican ears, and hints the peculiar usefulness of such a person to the government.

³ Contrast the different aspect given to the same philosophy in the conclusion of III. 8, '*dona praesentis cape laetus horae, linque severa.*'

some of the language used has no point, if it is to be tied strictly to the *apparent* meaning:

Fortuna saevo lacta negotio et
 ludum insolentem ludere pertinax
~~transmutat~~ incertos honores
 nunc mihi nunc alii benigna—

To a Roman *honores* suggests the *political* favours of Fortune. What was *shifting office* to Horace, whose highest civil employment had been a clerkship in the treasury, from which he was only too delighted to be set free? The rest is too long for examination, but it seems to me impossible to read it without feeling that the minister thus addressed must have suffered misfortune, and is probably in fear of more. Nor is the cause forgotten: 'Come into the Sabine hills', says Horace, 'and so escape the sameness of view from your mansion at Rome,

ne semper udum Tibur et Aesulæ
 declive contempleris aruum et
 Telegoni iuga *parricidæ*.'

(The emphasis given to this last word is not arbitrary, it is demanded by the unusual rhythm and order¹). Why Tusculum should be described by this legendary allusion, and why the contemplation of it in this light should be particularly irksome to Maecenas, we shall perhaps understand if we remember that *parricidium* was the Roman name for 'treasonable murder' and that the heir of M. Varro may be presumed to have succeeded to his villa at Tusculum. Whatever might be Maecenas' opinion as to the strength of the evidence against his brother-in-law, this association of ideas would not increase the charm of his prospect.

But there was one part of the story which concerned Maecenas even more nearly than the guilt or innocence of Murena, and that was his own betrayal of the emperor's secret. Augustus certainly believed that the detection of the conspiracy was disclosed by Maecenas to Terentia². Circumstances favour the charge, and I cannot find in the *Odes* any hint of a denial,

¹ cf. II. 13. 12, III. 6. 8.

² Suet. *Aug.* 66.

which would probably have been useless, and possibly unsafe. Assuming the fact, the minister's best and only exculpation lay in the extravagant fondness which he is known to have felt for his wife¹, and which must have made the possession of this fatal secret a trial such as might overtax stronger nerves than his. This excuse Horace has not forgotten to emphasize—

num tu quae tenuit dives Achaemenes
aut pinguis Phrygiæ Mygdonias opes
permutare velis crine Licymniæ
plenas aut Arabum domos²?

When the poem which celebrates the love of Maecenas for Terentia was originally *written*, is, like other such enquiries, beyond our knowledge³. That in the shape it now has, and as part of the collection, it has been modelled to suit the whole, we may see from the significant allusion to the defeat of the Giants—

Telluris iuvenes, unde periculum
fulgens contremuit domus
Saturni veteris—

put prominently, yet as if by chance, among the topics of song which Maecenas would *not* find to his taste. Indeed it is an obvious doubt whether under ordinary circumstances, to *publish* this picture of conjugal caresses would have been either friendly or becoming. So far as Maecenas is concerned, there is nothing to disturb the apologetic effect of it in relation to the events of the year 22, and there *is* a hint which the political friends of the minister could not be expected to suppress—

me dulces dominae Musa Licymniæ
cantus, me voluit dicere lucidum
fulgentes oculos et bene mutuis
fidum pectus amoribus.

If Maecenas to relieve his own burden somewhat prema-

¹ See Smith *Dict. Biog.* 'Maecenas'. His vain rebellions and repeated submissions led to the remark that though he had but one wife he married a thousand times.

² II. 12. 21. As to the identity of *Licymnia* with Maecenas' *Licina*-Ter-

entia see Note B. and the Essay *Venus and Myrtale*. That it should ever have been doubted proves we have still something to learn about the feelings of Horace and the nature of the *Odes*.

³ The *ostensible* date of it is between 30 and 25. See next Essay.

turely confided the secret to his wife, was he responsible for the further disclosure? Might he not at least have supposed that in her *faith* a trust upon which his honour depended would safely rest? In general, the odes to Maecenas are, as might be expected, silent on the subject. There is, however, one passage, in a poem of the widest generality, which cannot, after 22, have been either written or published without consideration of its possible bearing on *the* topic. The reader will not be surprised to find that it is notoriously one of the most obscure in the whole book. The second poem in Book III. commences with the education of youth in public virtue. 'Let them be hardened', says the poet, 'into good soldiers' (1—12). The sequel is a series of transitions, to the sweetness of the patriot's death in arms, thence to manly worth in general, and its independence of popular favour (illustrated not from war but from politics 19—20), and lastly, with great abruptness, to *faithful silence, which betrays no secret*,—the connexion being apparently no other than that patriotism, independence, and fidelity are all the fruits of sound training—

est et fideli tuta silentio
merces ; vetabo qui Cereris sacrum
volgarit arcanae, sub isdem
sit trabibus, fragilemve mecum
solvat phaselon : saepe Diespiter
neglectus incesto addidit integrum ;
raro antecedentem scelestum
deseruit pede poena claudo.

Obviously this is an unusual way of writing, and much has been said by way of explaining it. I am inclined to think that the obscurity is intentional. Against the possibility of interpreting the last two stanzas as a denunciation of Maecenas, Horace might fairly think that the whole book was a sufficient guard. Moreover the betrayal of the 'Cereris sacrum', to the Romans a natural symbol of the *confarreatio*, points much rather at the offence of the wife than the offence of the husband (agreeing in this with II. 12); in any case the complaint that "*Jupiter* often confounds the innocent with the guilty" could not possibly do anything but good, while the generality and

loose construction of the poem have the result, most desirable in a case of such extreme delicacy, of saving the writer from responsibility for any meaning in particular.

Considering that our knowledge of the conspiracy of Caepio and of Murena's story is but the barest outline, and how important is the relation between this story and the *Odes*, which antecedent probability and external evidence combine to prove, we plainly cannot expect to understand that relation completely. For the first readers of Horace, and specially for the circle of Maecenas, every detail in the plot, the circumstances, and the persons was a burning memory, and it is likely enough that many a passage where we see nothing but commonplace brought tears to the eyes of Terentia or Proculeius. But in losing what after all was not intended for us, we need not lose the enhancement of effect, which accrues to a large part of the book from so much of the history as remains to us. If the lyrics of Horace, with all their grace and vigour, have been found—a notorious complaint—somewhat trite, artificial, and cold, it is, I believe, in part because, where we think of mankind, Horace was thinking of *a man*. When Horace speaks to Sestius, or Plancus, or Dellius, or the public at large, of the proper use of wealth, the dangers of ambition, and the certainty of death, he addresses a society 'quaking' yet from such a 'roll of thunder in the blue sky' as calls careless men to the thought of their own frailty and of the terrible caprices of Fortune¹, wondering yet where the next bolt might fall. When Sestius is bidden enjoy the pleasant season of spring, while the missiles (which Jupiter will hurl in summer) are still in the forging, for

vitae summa brevis spem vos vetat inchoare longam,

we are no more impressed by the name of *Sestius* than if it were Titius or Seius². It was otherwise with men by whom *Sestius* was associated with the cult of regicides, and who but a few years ago had seen the promotion of a *Sestius* to the consulship followed by the conspiracy and punishment of 'the Titans'. When the proposition, that death often assails men from the

¹ I. 34.

² I. 4.

quarter which they least expect, is illustrated by the example of the soldier who fears the Parthian arrow, and the Parthian who fears the chains and dungeon of Rome—

miles sagittas et celerem fugam
Parthi, catenas Parthus et Italum
robur¹: sed improvisa leti
vis rapuit rapietque gentes—

we might perhaps think that the commonplace is scarcely improved by the exaggerated comparison. Not so, when the disregarded peril of the prison had recently brought proud and gallant nobles into the hand of the executioner, and none knew what guilty Caepio or not so guilty Murena might be the next occupant of that gloomy cell. It is particularly in the Second and Third Books that this effect is felt. In the Second there is but a small proportion of poems, which, even with our scanty knowledge, do not show some touch on the political and personal feelings which are the main topics of the work. The topics—and in part the cause; for we are not without warrant from Horace himself for doubting whether but for the story of Murena much of the *Odes* might ever have been written. Of that which directly refers to him this is of course true, but I do not speak of this only. The Three Books contain almost all the ‘poetry’, in the stricter sense, which Horace composed of his own accord. The Fourth Book was an imposed task. In the *Epodes* grace and elevation of feeling are for the most part excluded by the theory of the style². The rest, the larger part of his work—be it better or worse—he himself not untruly describes as prose in metre. Yet he was highly ambitious of literary fame, and evidently regarded ‘poetry’ as the best foundation for it³. His ear for rhythm, his knowledge of literature, his patient industry are proved by the lyrics themselves and his own testimony. In spite of this, a very small volume contains the whole ‘poetic’ product of some thirty

¹ The ‘Tullianum’ where state-prisoners were confined and executed.

² See the commentaries, III. 15, 17. ³ III. 30. He often defends his other work against bad criticism, but never

² A very few such, as VII. and XVI. speaks of it in this tone.

years, and, if he had had his will, it would have been still smaller. The fact appears to be that, in general, Horace *could* not write 'poetry', nor is it difficult to guess why. Poetry, whether grave or gay, is not to be written without emotion. The 'philosophic' habit of mind delineated in the *Satires* and *Epistles* is the least poetic of all. What art and industry and a complete command of the best materials could do in the way of lyric poetry without earnestness, we may see in such poems as I. 10 or I. 21. But there are times when even the *nil admirari* nature is moved beyond its wont, and the lax string of the humorist may be strained to a more musical tensivity.

An appalling event, such as from a mind habitually gloomy might almost take the power of expression, to a lighter nature may bring the steadiness and gravity required for serious work. As Horace himself says, it is the thunder-peal of Jove, the spectacle of a sudden and terrible catastrophe, which rouses the follower of *insaniens sapientia* to a sense of the might of Fortune and the weakness of man,—the subject, as again he himself tells us, of the severe Muse¹. Now we have seen that Horace regarded his lyric poetry in general as a gift of this Muse, and from the point of view here indicated, I think the ascription is comprehensible, even in the widest sense. Of a considerable portion of it it may be said, that in actual theme it is an 'Ode of Fortune', a descant in various moods upon the perishing pleasures, the certain, and often sudden, death of man—touched with something of tragedy by the awful story, so near to Horace and to his readers, of which the outline is so powerfully dashed in. What the fall of Antonius is to the hymn to the queen of Antium, that the fall of Murena is to the entire work. When this element is subtracted there remains indeed much exquisite writing, some which a cool criticism might perhaps rightly call best of the whole, such as the address to Barine², or the expostulation with Asterie³. How much even of the poetic power displayed in such poems as these, compared

¹ I. 34. and 35. On the relation and historical bearing of these poems, see Essay III. On 'Fortune' and Tra-

gedy see II. 1, and Essay I.

² II. 8.

³ III. 7.

with such a piece as the first Ode to Mercurius¹, is due to the unusual tension of mind produced by such events as those of the years 31 and 22, we cannot say. Horace gives to Melpomene the credit of them all. Englishmen, at least, need find no difficulty in understanding him; for the case may be illustrated by a very pertinent example from our own literature. Between Horace and Gray the differences are many and obvious, but they agree in one striking point. Both wrote much that is not poetry (Horace publishing, Gray keeping his prose private); both wrote also poetry exquisite in finish but, though both were long at full leisure for writing, very small in amount. And we have Gray's own word that 'if he did not write much it was because he could not.' This incapacity is of course to be understood as an incapacity of spirit. Gray could have written as many *verses* as Mason; Horace could probably have composed 'Alcaics' enough to fill a *Corpus*. But the English poet certainly, the Roman presumably, could not write *poetry* except at rare intervals. "And it may here be remarked", says the biographer of Gray, "as a very singular fact that the death of a valued friend seems to have been the stimulus of greatest efficacy in rousing Gray to the composition of poetry, and did in fact excite him to the *completion* of his most important poems."²

Exegi monumentum aere perennius...
...Sume superbiam
quaesitam meritis et mihi Delphica
lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam.

Seeing the large influence, direct and indirect, which the story of Murena appears to have had upon the original Three Books, it is interesting to enquire whether the subject is touched

¹ I. 10.

² Gray. E. W. Gosse, p. 66.

in the additional Book written and published many years afterwards at the instance of Augustus. Before examining this point, we may notice that in one respect the relation between this Book as a whole and the preceding receives light from this side. The service required from Horace was to celebrate the conquest of the tribes of the Eastern Alps in the year 15 by the emperor's step-sons Tiberius and Drusus¹. As it is implied by Suetonius that both this and the composition of the *Carmen Saeculare* (B.C. 17) were not willingly undertaken, there is reason for asking why Horace did not confine himself to the commissions. If the original work had been a mere collection of detached pieces, it would have been simple to insert in it one or two poems such as IV. 4, IV. 14, and even the *Carmen* itself. But the collection being what it is, such a course was impossible. Not only are the Three Books dedicated in the main to feelings private and political, with which paeans on the military glories of Tiberius would have been little in harmony, but their chronological structure and proportions would have been altogether disturbed by isolated references to the year 15. All three moreover, and particularly the Second and Third, in so far as they do not deal with pure fiction², are tinged with the colour, if I may use the expression, of the agitated time which separated the conspiracy of Murena from the conspiracy of Egnatius. To introduce later history with proper effect would have required a remodelling of the whole.

On the other hand, the conditions of Horace's task and the manner in which he has executed it plainly suggest the probability of some allusion to the earlier theme. The fame of the Three Books and the emperor's good opinion of their durable quality caused the request which produced the Fourth³. Under these circumstances, the author of the ode on the *Titano-*

¹ Suet. *Vit. Hor.* Vindelicam victoriam Tiberi Drusique privignorum suorum componendam iniunxit, eumque coegit propter hoc tribus carminum libris ex longo intervallo quartum addere.

² It is important also to remember that much which we *think* fictitious and without connexion is very probably not so. See next Essay.

³ Suet. *l.c.*

*machia*¹ when pressed to invoke his Melpomene in the interest of Tiberius, was not likely to forget his 'Delius et Patareus Apollo', nor him either, who fell by the scattering shafts of that ambitious young god, nor to omit anything which could or should be done for the self-respect of the Muse and for the unfortunate subject of her tragedy. Melpomene is by no means forgotten, her dignity being saved by one of the most spirited and elegant poems in the fifteen², and two more are occupied wholly or chiefly with self-praise³, a proportion only to be excused by the circumstances, and not fully balanced by the elaborate humility of the parallel between the poet and Pindar⁴. Maecenas is not forgotten⁵, nor that symbol of the moon, which in the first collection has so deep a significance. There is one poem in the supplement, certainly not the worst, which has often been noticed for its peculiar resemblance to the style and tone of the original Books. It may even be conjectured to exist chiefly for the sake of this resemblance, and specially for the sake of the exquisite verses,

damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia *lunae*,
nos, ubi decidimus
quo pater Aeneas quo dives Tullus et Ancus,
pulvis et umbra sumus⁶.

Four odes execute the emperor's command, two on the victory of his sons, two pendants in direct compliment to himself⁷. The last of them repairs a significant omission in the earlier work, and is the one lyric in which the poet brings his real self and the real Caesar into personal communion as it were. The relation is slight and semi-official, still it is there, and the peaceful sentiment shows that old scars are healed or healing. As for the rest of the book, there is as little of it as would "afford a plausible pretext for the publication" of the official portion⁸—or rather, this accounts sufficiently for all the remaining poems⁹ *except one*. I should be sorry to exaggerate a

¹ III. 4.

² IV. 3.

³ IV. 8, IV. 9.

⁴ IV. 2.

⁵ IV. 11.

⁶ IV. 7. 13.

⁷ IV. 4, IV. 5, IV. 14, IV. 15.

⁸ Mr Page, *Introd. to Book iv.*

⁹ IV. 1, IV. 10, IV. 12, IV. 13.

fanciful impression, but I do find much that still needs explanation in the purpose and meaning of IV. 6. Mr Wickham truly says that the Fourth Book shows signs of careful arrangement—whether the Three Books show less, is another matter. Now in this arrangement, what is the function of IV. 6? It purports to be written during the preparation for the *Carmen Saeculare*; I shall endeavour presently to show that this it almost certainly was not, that it cannot have been brought to its present form so early as the year 17, nor in fact any earlier than the other ‘public’ odes of the book. Indeed, the very position of it is suspicious. If it is merely what it pretends to be, why, in a work showing careful arrangement, do we find it disjoined from its sequel, and thrust into the midst of poems on the conquest of the Vindelici in 15 and the return of Augustus from Gaul in 13?¹ The construction and the selection of topics are equally strange.

The hymn for the *Ludi Saeculares* is written, as every one knows, for a double chorus of boys and maidens, and is addressed with exact equality to Phoebus and Diana. Now let us criticize IV. 6 as a prelude to such a hymn. The poem has eleven stanzas. The essential part—the ‘operative’ part, as a draughtsman would say—is contained in the last five. The poet prays Phoebus, the teacher of the Greek Thalia (Muse of festival poetry) to ‘protect the honour of a Daunian Camena’, his own Italian Muse, that is, for Phoebus is the giver of his spirit and his art; then turning to his boys and girls, the wards of the huntress Diana, he bids them, like a Greek χοροδιδάσκαλος, to mark his beating of the time and to practise the *Carmen Saeculare*, concluding prettily with a sort of paternal encouragement to one of the girls. All this, if not very interesting, is to the point; and if it were the whole, that is all that could be said of it. As it is, this complete poem is preceded by a longer poem, addressed to Phoebus only, neither Diana, nor the chorus, nor the poet, nor the festival being mentioned, with the result that we are nearing the end

¹ If it were not for IV. 6, the arrangement of the Fourth Book would show the same chronological principle

in that of the Three. (See next Essay). In fact the poem is ostentatiously out of place.

(1—30), before we have a hint of the situation. Pindar himself could not be more independent of logical trammels. Further, the bearing of the preliminaries on the conclusion is this—Phoebus preserved the remnant of Troy, which under Aeneas founded Rome, without which there would have been no *Ludi Saeculares*. And how and why did he preserve the future Romans? (I would ask the reader, if possible, to forget the poem and imagine a natural answer to the question.) As founder of Troy, it might be supposed, as augur and leader of wandering nations, he brought the destined remnant safe out of the destruction. Such is the answer, at all events, furnished by the *Carmen* itself.¹ But no—the real salvation of Aeneas, it seems, was the death of Achilles. For, (observe the connexion) in the *Iliad* Agamemnon expresses the wish that not a Trojan may escape: therefore, if Achilles had lived to storm Troy, none *would* have escaped (?); therefore—more than one third of a short poem on the *Carmen Saeculare* is occupied with the character and intentions of Achilles! Surely it is inconceivable that such a train of thought should arise naturally out of the subject, or that any writer, not to say Horace, could work it into form without perceiving the want not only of proportion but of sequence. (Contrast, for example, the management of the theme in III. 3, or III. 11.)² We sometimes read explanations of lyric poetry, which seem to assume the principle that any topic, if it can be reached in the course or *discourse* of the fancy, may be enlarged at pleasure without respect to its relevance; German is even provided with a term for the art, to wit, “poetische Verweilung”. It may be doubted whether the wildest dithyrambist really composed in this fashion; to attribute it, when we can do no better, to the sane and diligent Horace, seems but a bad way of saying that we do not understand him. Even granting the licence, it is abused beyond reason in the poem we are considering, and we ought to admit, either that the poem is mis-shapen, or that it has been shaped in the main by some motive not professed, and that the *Carmen Saeculare* must

¹ C.S. 37—44, 61—69.

² On III. 3 see Plüss, *Horaz-Studien* p. 211.

be a mere excuse. To put it otherwise, the topic of Achilles is 'dragged in'. Why is it dragged in?

To seek an answer, let us have the 'poetische Verweilung' before us.

Dive, quem proles Niobeae magnae
vindicem linguae Tityosque raptor
sensit et Troiae prope victor altae
Phthius Achilles,
ceteris maior, tibi miles inpar,
filius quamvis Thetidis marinae
Dardanas turres quateret tremenda
cuspidē pugnae :
ille mordaci velut ieta ferro
pinus aut impulsa cupressus Euro,
procidit late posuitque collum in
pulvere Teucro :
ille non inclusus equo Minervae
sacra mentito male feriatos
Troas et laetam Priami choreis
falleret aulam ;
sed palam captis gravis, heu nefas, heu,
nescios fari pueros Achivis
ureret flammis, etiam latentem
matris in alvo,
ni tuis flexus Venerisque gratae
vocibus divom pater adnuisset
rebus Aeneae potiore ductos
alite muros :
doctor Argivae fidicen Thaliae,
Phoebe, qui Xantho lavis amne crines,
Dauniae defende decus Camenae,
levis Agyieū.
spiritum Phoebus mihi, Phoebus artem
carminis nomenque dedit poetae : etc.

Now there is one phrase here, which occurring in a set of poems written by commission to celebrate the conquest of the Rhaeti and Vindelici, could not fail to attract special notice. Achilles would not have taken Troy by a treacherous surprise; but after the sack he would have put to death every Trojan male, *yea, even the babe yet hidden in its mother's womb*. Commentators point out that this is borrowed from the wish of Agamemnon,

μήτις ὑπέκφυγοι αἰπὺν δλεθρον
 χεῖρας θ' ἡμετέρας· μήδ' ὄντινα γαστέρι μίτηρ
 κοῦρον ἔόντα φέροι, μήδ' ὅς φύγοι¹.

But when the victory of Tiberius and Drusus was recent, no Roman could read the words without thinking of cruelties much nearer than the Trojan war. The expedition against the Rhaeti was provoked, according to the Romans, by a practice of peculiar (and happily impossible) barbarity. Not content with the normal savagery of raids upon their Italian neighbours and ill-treatment of travellers, they put to death all males they could capture, *including the unborn*, whose sex they discovered by magic, οὐχ ὅτι τὸ φαινόμενον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐν ταῖς γαστράσιν ἔτι τῶν γυναικῶν ὄν, μαντείαις τισὶν ἀνευρίσκοντες². The phrase of Dion Cassius is even more like Horace than the phrase of Homer, for Dion, who is no doubt following the Roman historians, has an equivalent for *latentem*, which Homer has not. This side-glance at the iniquities, which Tiberius and his brother had put down, is so far instructive, as it confirms the suspicion arising from the position of the poem, that the writing of it had little to do with the festival of the year 17. It was written, or at least three-fourths of it was written, for the book in which it is found, and on the same occasion, several years after the *Ludi Saeculares*; and the *Divus* of whom Horace is thinking at the commencement, is not, as he afterwards would make appear, the co-patron of the festival, but the imperial Apollo or his representative, the princely avenger of Rome upon the Alpine barbarians.

But we are as far as ever or farther from an explanation of the whole. The logical and mythological skill of Horace had strangely fallen off since the Ode to the Muses (III. 4), if to make this point he could devise nothing neater than a description of Achilles. Most of the first stanza, all the second third and fourth must still be called 'Verweilung', *Anglice* irrelevant. What, above all, is the point of the contrast between treachery and open hostility, which, from the emphasis it

¹ *Il.* vii. 57. The connexion with Achilles is perhaps suggested by *Il.* xxii. 63. Orelli *ad loc.*

² *Dion.* 51. 22.

receives, would appear to be all-important¹? The captures of the Rhaeti were open enough. It is plain that the glance at contemporary history is only a glance; the main purpose is still to seek.

As the fourth poem of the Third Book was lately under our consideration, it will probably not have escaped the reader, that the opening of that now before us is one of the points of Book IV., which touches the earlier collection at an assignable place. Apollo is invoked as the punisher of the lustful Tityus. These figures are associated in the Three Books also, once only², and there, as we saw, in an allegory, in which Apollo stands for Tiberius and his enemies for the conspirators or supposed conspirators indicted by him in the year 22. We have just seen that here also, in the invocation of Apollo, Tiberius was not far from the poet's thoughts. Will the reminiscence thus indicated give any help in the difficulties of the sequel? Supposing that in the victims of Apollo's vengeance we are again to find the associates of Caepio, another reference to the collection will at once fix the identity of *Achilles*. There is only one historical person in the *Odes*³ who is paralleled with Achilles, and that is by way of compliment. 'You talk of *ancient* patriots and warriors' says the guest of Murena in III. 19, 'and say nothing of our host'.

Quantum distet ab Inacho
Codrus, pro patria non timidus mori,
narras, et genus *Aeaci*
et pugnata sacro bella sub Ilio :
quo praebente domum.....
Paelignis caream frigoribus taces.

Aeacus had several descendants, and more than one fought beneath sacred Ilium; but one *Aeacides* throws the rest into the shade, and the giver of the toast to Murena would have been surprised to be told that his comparison did not sufficiently

¹ Note the stress on *ille* (v. 12) by the similar commencement (*Anaphora*) of v. 9, and the prominent antithesis of *ille non...sed palam*.

² III. 4. 77.

³ 'Xanthias' is compared to Achilles (II. 4. 4) but if 'Xanthias' had an original, the poem with its miscellaneous mythology seems designed to prevent recognition. See also I. 8. 13.

designate the hero of the *Iliad*. Will this comparison help us to explain the construction of IV. 6? One point at least, the most difficult of all, it will clear at once—and that is the purpose of the third and fourth stanzas. The sharp antithesis between the treacherous surprise which *Achilles* would have disdained and the open enmity which (alas!) was *not* inconsistent with his character—all this is as much to the real purpose of Horace, as it is alien from the practice for the *Carmen Saeculare*. Horace had earned the right to speak his mind; if he consented to celebrate the victories of Tiberius, it was because Augustus condescended to beg, and the poet, as he himself says, *poterat pretium dicere muneri* (IV. 8, 12). The price which he took of the emperor and his step-son was the liberty to say, plainly enough for them and the higher society of Rome, what in his former book he hardly dared to hint—that a certain person, though he was, as the poet had said before, both arrogant and inhumane, and though, as an enemy to ‘Apollo’, he had used an insolence (*magna lingua*) for which he paid dear, nevertheless was an honourable enemy, and not, as the senatorial judges were pleased to decide, a treacherous assassin. Like the huge *pine*, which courts the winds, was his overtopping greatness (II. 10. 10); like the *pine* beneath the axe or the cypress bowed by the East wind he fell, and the *towers* that shook at his spear were but symbols of his own overthrow before a mightier than he (II. 10. 11). There is very little in the description which even for us has not a traceable reference to the *Murena* of the first three books; and it is reasonable to suppose that if Caepio’s plot and Murena’s life were better known to us, we could interpret much that is now without meaning.

Thus the strange construction of the poem, if not technically justified, is at least historically explained. The real importance of the two parts is inversely as their ostensible importance; and the very irrelevance of the preface to the sequel is practically not without advantage, when it is to be understood that the ‘sequel’ is a mere excuse for the ‘preface.’ And indeed there is connexion enough between the two, though it is not the wire-drawn thread of mythical logic

which is seen at first view. Between the Saecular Festival and the death of Achilles there is no real connexion at all; but between the retrospective defence of Murena and the *writing* of the *Carmen Saeculare* there is a connexion, and a very significant one. To the success of the *vates Horatius* as poet of the Roman nation in the *Carmen Saeculare*, as much as to the fame of his three books, might be attributed the request or injunction of the emperor that he should bend his powers to the praise of Tiberius. In no way, therefore, could he better dignify his compliance than by thus conjoining the renown of 'Apollo' *vindex magnae linguae* with an allusion to the Rhaetian war, with his own dignity as author of the *Carmen*, and above all with an emphatic declaration that treachery was not in the character of 'Achilles'. If the result is not very artistic, the immediate object was something more important even than art to 'the honour of the Daunian Muse'; it was to be shown that Phoebus had given the poet not only 'art' but 'spirit'.

¹ The literary and moral meanings of *spiritus* are precisely those of its modern representative (see the Dictionary s.v.), and the equivoque is the same in Latin as in English. It has not been forgotten in the somewhat

similar passage II. 16. 37

mihi parva rura et
spiritum Graeae tenuem Camenae
 parca non mendax dedit, et malignum
spernere volgus.

NOTE A. (See pp. 16 foll. and p. 68.)

IN the foregoing account of Murena will be found no mention of two points usually given in the books of reference (Smith *Dict. Biog.*, Drumann *Geschichte Roms*) and editions of Horace, (1) that he was *consul suffectus* in B.C. 23, (2) that he conducted the war against the Salassi in B.C. 25.

The first statement, which is indirectly of the greatest importance, is founded, so far as I can discover, entirely upon an error—indeed, a double error. The consuls for the year 23 mentioned by Dion Cassius (53. 30 and *Argumenta*) are (1) Augustus XI., (2) Cn. Calpurnius Piso, (3) L. Sestius, *suffectus* in the place of Augustus after his resignation. These statements are confirmed so far as they go, by the various *Fasti* and other authorities. But from the *Fasti Capitolini*, as restored apparently with certainty by Th. Mommsen, we learn that Piso, as well as Augustus, had a predecessor, who died in office, named A. Terentius Varro Murena, (Corp. Inscr. Vol. I. p. 441). The omission of this person by Dion, who was not writing a calendar but a history, is only natural. His tenure of office must have been exceedingly brief, for Piso had succeeded him before the illness of Augustus, the very first event mentioned in the year. The conspirator, then, if identified with this A. Terentius, would be not ‘*consul suffectus*’ but original consul for that year. The identity is generally assumed and apparently not denied by the editor of the *Fasti* (Corp. Inscr. note on p. 450). But it is not merely unproved, it is clearly impossible. The one thing we know of Aulus is that he died early in 23, a full year before Lucius conspired. To make them identical, it would, in the first place, be necessary to throw over the whole account of the conspiracy of Caepio

and Murena given by Dion *in the year 22*, in natural sequence *after* the death of Marcellus (autumn of 23), and to transfer it, against both authority and probability, to the very beginning of the previous year. The date of Dion is confirmed by Velleius (II. 93), who allows 'about three years' between the conspiracy of Egnatius (B.C. 19) and that of Murena. Further, we should have to account for the fact that neither Suetonius nor Velleius (who is careful to sketch the official career of Egnatius, II. 91) nor Seneca nor Tacitus gives a hint that Murena was actually consul at the time of the conspiracy, surely a circumstance not to be omitted if true. It seems hardly necessary to discuss further a hypothesis without base and contradicted by all the evidence.

The only suggestion of identity is the partial resemblance of name, and even this will not bear inspection. The conspirator is called—by Horace *Licinius* or (twice) *Murena*, by Suetonius *Varro Murena* (*Aug.* 19, *Tib.* 8) or *Murena* (*Aug.* 56 *ib.* 66), by Velleius (*l. c.*) *L. Murena* or *Murena*, by Dion (*l. c.*) *Licinius Murena* or *Murena*, by Seneca *Murena* (*de Brev. Vit.* 5. 4, *de Clem.* I. 9. 5.) All the authorities agree in showing that his proper name was *Licinius Murena*, *Varro* being an acquired distinction. There is no proof that he ever assumed the gentile name *Terentius*, and the only prænomen which he receives is *Lucius*. He is not called even *Varro* simply, except in an anecdote, probably referring to him, in Suet. *de Grammaticis* 9—'Orbilius interrogatus a Varrone diversae partis advocato, quidnam ageret et quo artificio uteretur, *gibberosos se de sole in umbram transferre* respondit, quod *Murena* gibber erat,' where it is plain from the context that we ought to restore the passage to conformity with the usage of Suetonius in the *Vita Caesarum* by writing in the first place *Varrone Murena*. Tacitus (*Ann.* I. 10) writes *Varrones* in an allusion, *interfectos Romae Varrones Egnatios Iulos* 'a Varro, an Egnatius, an Iulus'; but this is explained by the invidious purpose, for which the illustrious name of the great scholar is much more effective than *Murenas* would have been. As for the consul of 23 A. Terentius Varro Murena, the modern authorities are

probably right in connecting him, by identification or descent, with the *Varro Murena* mentioned in Cic. *ad Fam.* III. 22, and immediately afterwards called '*Varro*' simply, with the *A. Terentius* of Cic. *pro Caec.* 9, and the *A. Varro* of Cic. *ad Fam.* 16. 12 and Caes. *Bell. Civ.* 3. 19. On the one hand we have an *A. Terentius Varro*, who had acquired and sometimes bore the distinctive addition *Murena*, on the other a *L. Licinius Murena*, sometimes also called *Varro*—not a strong ground for identifying two persons whose histories are quite irreconcilable. How this branch of the *Terentii Varrones* came by the name *Murena*, we do not know and need not enquire. How the conspirator came by the name *Varro*, we do need to know and, I think, may discover. If he ever took the name *Terentius* at all, it was probably with the prænomen *Marcus*; but we do not know that he did.

The second point, whether *Murena* the conspirator was commander in the war against the Salassi and founder (on behalf of Augustus) of *Aosta*, cannot be so easily decided. The commander is called *Terentius Varro* both by Dion Cassius and Strabo. Supposing that he is identical with some *Terentius Varro* otherwise known to us, the most probable is the consul of B.C. 23. On the other hand, *if* the conspirator could ever have been described by these names, the year 25 would be a very natural time; for the Romans, like ourselves, sometimes assumed the name of a testamentary benefactor for a time and afterwards dropped or modified it; and the identification would bring an additional point to the allusion in Hor. *Od.* III. 4. 38 (see above p. 59). On the whole, however, probability seems against it. The name *Terentius Varro* is itself a difficulty, and there is no evidence to show that *Murena* ever stood in such relations to the imperial government, as to have been selected for a command so important and, if abused, so dangerous. To make him senator and augur was another thing.

A few words may be added on the name of the conspirator's sister, wife of Maecenas. The historians, all whose notices date from times after 22, call her *Terentia*, Horace in II. 12 *Licymnia*. It is generally said (see Orelli and others) that this represents

Terentia, by equivalence of quantity, according to the practice in amatory compositions—Lesbia = Clodia (Catullus), Delia = Plania (Tibullus), Cynthia = Hostia (Propertius), etc. The analogy however is imperfect, for the amatory names are *really intended to conceal*, while (apart from the grotesque inconsistency between such a poem as II. 12 and the general tone of the Three Books, if *Licymnia* were any other than the wife) Maecenas' *domina* could not possibly escape identification. The resemblance to *Licinia* is surely more striking than the quantitative equivalence to *Terentia*. Indeed the choice of the Greek name is probably not altogether arbitrary. It was a common practice among the Roman nobility to trace their origin through such resemblances into Greek mythical antiquity; thus Vergil deduces the *Sergii* from Sergestes, the *Cluentii* from Cloanthus; and the analogy of Λικύμνιος—*Licinius* is not likely to have escaped the genealogists. Historically, the 'sister' of Murena,—if we interpret *soror* as meaning the closest relationship it can, and the events of 22 suggest that we should,—probably took by birth the name *Licinia*; she *may* have changed it for *Terentia* when her brother became *Varro* Murena, and for similar reasons; at all events after 22 it is easy to see why *Terentia* was preferred. In using a form which points so strongly to *Licinia*, Horace gives II. 12 an *ostensible* date which suits with its purpose and position. Of course the possibility of the interpretation *Terentia* did not escape his notice and is extremely convenient.

It is curious to note that the taste for dancing, even in public, by which *Licinia* had evidently scandalized some of her grave countrymen (II. 12. 17), was in the family. Cicero (*pro Murena* 6) defends the consul of 62, probably her father, against a similar reproach.

NOTE B. (See pp. 16 foll.)

The accounts of the temporary estrangement of Augustus from Maecenas are dissimilar but easily explained. Suetonius, among whose materials were Augustus' autograph documents, refers it entirely to the conspiracy of Murena. *Neque enim temere ex omni numero in amicitia eius afflicti reperientur praeter Salvidienum...et Gallum...Reliqui potentia atque opibus ad finem vitae...floruerunt, quamquam et offensis intervenientibus. Desideravit enim nonnunquam...Maecenatis taciturnitatem, cum hic secretum de comperta Murenæ coniuratione uxori Terentiae prodidisset* (Aug. 66). Dion says nothing of Maecenas under the year 22 (732), except that he could not save Murena, but under the year 16 (738), upon the visit of Augustus to Gaul and the creation of the office of *praefectus urbis*, he says, καὶ τινες καὶ διὰ τὴν Τερεντίαν τὴν τοῦ Μαικήνου γυναῖκα ἀποδημῆσαι αὐτὸν ὑπετόπησαν, ἵν' (ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ Πρώμῃ ἐλογοποιεῖτο) ἄνευ θροῦ τινὸς ἐν τῇ ἀλλοδημίᾳ αὐτῇ συνῇ· οὕτω γὰρ οὖν πάνυ αὐτῆς ἦρα ὥστε καὶ ἀγωνίσασθαί ποτε αὐτὴν περὶ τοῦ κάλλους πρὸς τὴν Λιουίαν ποιῆσαι...καὶ οὕτω τὸ μὲν ἄστν τῷ Ταύρῳ (Statilius Taurus, first *praefectus urbis*) μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης Ἰταλίας διοικεῖν ἐπιτρέψας—τόν τε γὰρ Ἀγρίππαν ἐς τὴν Συρίαν αὐθις ἐστάλκει, καὶ τῷ Μαικῆνᾳ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα οὐκέθ' ὁμοίως ἔχαιρε—ἐξώρμησεν (54. 19).

Now since the visit to Gaul had fully adequate political motives, as afterwards appeared (Dion. 54. 20), the conjecture of these sagacious 'gossips' about the cause of it was perfectly gratuitous; and Suetonius shows that they were equally wrong about the disgrace of Maecenas. Why these profound speculations were made in the year 16, and not before, is plain enough. Maecenas never held any office known to the law, and

after the war of Alexandria, had, as far as we know, no definite commission at all. He was *supposed*, as in 30, to watch Italy and the capital, especially in the emperor's absence (Hor. Od. III. 8. 7, III. 29. 25; both these may be naturally referred to such absences): but he was not nominally and officially *prae-fectus urbis*, as is proved by the history of the *praelectura* in Tac. Ann. VI. 11. It has been inferred from Horace (*ll. cc.*) that he was charged with foreign affairs, but the distance of the dangers indicated (*'urbi sollicitus times, quid Seres parent etc.'*) has sufficient point without this supposition. The negative evidence of Dion Cassius and Velleius makes it very improbable that after the establishment of the empire, his active functions, either within or without the city, were of much importance. As long therefore, as no one was substituted for him, there was nothing for the *λογοποιοί* of Rome to speculate about; the appointment of the *praelectus* set them at work. But his real importance as a counsellor (Tac. Ann. 3. 30) was a question not of status but of confidence, and the breach of confidence occurred in 22.

As for the connexion with Terentia, it may be doubted whether it was even a reality. Suetonius says nothing about it, and that is not all. He does say in general terms *adulteria eum exercuisse ne amici quidem negant*. After this, any one who has studied the 'Lives of the Caesars' might wager that if there was specific proof against Terentia, Suetonius could not find it. For earlier scandals about Octavian he cites his authority—the Letters of Antonius! If all evidence about the *amours* of public men were ruled inadmissible, historic truth would gain more than it would lose.

That Maecenas retained the confidence of Augustus as late as the year 21 has been inferred from the anecdote in Dion 54. 7, that he was consulted on the marriage of Julia to Agrippa, and said to the emperor, 'You have made him so great that he must either become your son-in-law, or be put to death'. But if this precise knowledge of 'what the king said to the queen' were not rather suspicious, the anecdote would still prove nothing about the real relations of the monarch and the

minister. That Maecenas suffered no outward disgrace may be inferred from Horace and the silence of the historians, and if so, of course he was still sometimes formally consulted. Moreover the consultation might refer to the months between the death of Marcellus and the conspiracy just as well as to those between the conspiracy and the departure of Augustus from Rome.

There is therefore nothing to shake the authority of the statement in Suetonius, which, supported as it is by the passage of Seneca quoted above (p. 23), seems beyond question.

THE HISTORICAL POEMS AND THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE THREE BOOKS.

More than once in the course of the preceding Essays I have used language implying that the Three Books of Odes, regarded as a whole, have a scheme,—that, among the facts bearing on the interpretation of a single poem, the place of that poem in the collection is or may be material. Of the historical poems, in particular, it was said in the first Essay that they seem to be so arranged as to form a sort of historical framework to the rest. It is time to explain and justify these propositions.

In doing this I must frequently employ such language as ‘the date of’ this or that piece; and as this phrase is open to a misunderstanding fatal to my meaning, I desire in the first place to clear it. By the date of an Ode I mean always *the internal* or, as I have elsewhere called it, *the ostensible date*, the time at which the lyric speaker is supposed to speak. If, as of course is very frequently the case, there is no such imagined time, if the time is not material to the picture, the poem has not, in the present sense, any date at all. In one sense, or rather two, every piece of literature has a date, a date of *writing* and a date of *publication*, but with neither of these *external* dates are we here concerned¹. The completion of the Three Books in their present form is fixed, as we have seen, by internal evidence to some time after the year 22 and probably in the winter of 20—19. Whether any part of the collection had been previously *published*, and if so, in what form and to how large a circle, we have neither adequate means to know nor

¹ The construction of *In Memoriam* and will be useful for comparison hereafter.
presents a parallel in our own literature

much interest in knowing. And as to the time at which the single poems were *written*, if by 'written' we mean 'brought to the form in which they finally appear', the only certain *terminus ad quem* is this same date of completion. (Minor changes may of course have been made even later, but we might infer from the commencement of the Fourth Book that, after the completion mentioned in the Epilogue to the Three, they did not receive any material addition, and Suetonius implies the same.) It cannot be asserted positively that any piece left the anvil earlier than this; on the other hand it is probable that Horace had been essaying lyric metres for ten years at least, perhaps for fifteen years or even longer, before the *monumentum aere perennius* was *exactum* to his mind. How the work was distributed over this period, or who may have seen it in earlier stages, I am not enquiring; for the present purpose all the poems of all the Three Books may be taken as if written and published *d'un seul coup* while the ship of Vergil was on its way to Athens. The question is, Upon what principle is the series arranged, and, in particular, Has chronology any influence on the arrangement? I propose to shew that it has¹.

Let us ask then, which of the poems have an *internal* date. We shall naturally look first at those which bear on public affairs, not only because public dates are for the most part better ascertained than private, but also—a point to which I would ask particular attention—because, in arranging a work for the public eye, only the public dates are necessary to be observed, in order to produce the general effect of a chronological sequence. Even public dates are not for this purpose all equally material. Only those will tell which are impressed on the public mind; and this impression depends upon many things, such as local proximity or picturesqueness of circumstance, quite different from the true relation in time or the permanent significance in history.

Suppose for example a series of German poems, dating

¹ I assume provisionally that the existing order and divisions are authentic. For the evidence of this, which

seems beyond reasonable doubt, see Wickham, Introduction § 2, *The Order of the Odes*.

apparently from various times in the last twenty years and dealing with events partly of world-wide notoriety, partly of private interest to the writer, and partly fictitious. Suppose the political sentiments to be those of a warm patriot and a supporter of the recently established Empire. If we found the book to be divided into three sections, of which the first concluded with a song upon the victory of Sadowa, the second with a description of the famous proclamation at Versailles, while the third contained, among other things, imaginary inscriptions for the war-monument at Berlin and the National Monument on the Niederwald; and if it further appeared, that so far as our recollection of recent history served, all the *political* pieces stood in the order of the events to which they referred, and that the chronology of the *private* pieces was consistent with itself—we should take this manner of marking the stages in the imperial progress as a material element in the work, no less confidently than if 1866 and 1871 had been printed on blank leaves between the sections. Nor should we cease to think so, if we found in the first book an epithalamium for the poet's daughter, and happened to hear that he really had a daughter but that she was not married till 1873. We might indeed feel some doubt of the information; but if we troubled ourselves to verify it and it proved correct, we should merely conclude that the place of the epithalamium had some advantage, for which the author thought it worth while to misdate it, justly supposing that neither the true date nor the false would be of any interest to his readers or affect the meaning and value of the poem. Of course the Three Books of Horace do not answer precisely to this supposed type—as the last twenty years of German history are not precisely analogous to the years of Rome between 40 and 20 B.C.—but the principle of their arrangement is not far unlike.

When Horace published the *Odes*, the political retrospect of the living generation was covered by one vast, unique, and all-embracing event—the establishment of the monarchy, the restoration of peace and security to the Roman world at the price of the Roman republic. This event, in one sense spread over many years and developed through several stages, in

another sense was consummated on a single day, the day of Octavian's triumphant entry into Alexandria, the final overthrow of his last rivals. For those who loved the new order, for those who hated it, and for those (probably more numerous than either among the intelligent average) who accepted it, like Horace, with a somewhat bitter and self-reproachful thankfulness,—for all alike the world began again

quo die
portus Alexandria supplex
et vacuum patefecit aulam.

In determining, therefore, whether the manner in which the poems are combined has any relation to history, this era is the first for which we must look. If it does *not* stand in prominent relief, the notion of a historical basis of arrangement may be at once dismissed. But it does. It is marked by the conclusion of the First Book, and the poet has used every possible device to fix the terminus deep. The stern yet not ungenerous song of rejoicing over the fall of Cleopatra (I. 37), one of the finest by universal judgment in the whole series, is the climax and in effect the close of the first division. To end abruptly upon a chord so loud would be contrary to the principle of ancient artists generally, that "the passion ought to die away in a diminuendo before the strain ceases".¹ The outburst of intense relief modulates, as it were, into the permanent mood of content, and the long-desired peace which is hailed with rapture in the 37th poem is simply felt in the two quiet stanzas of the 38th². The preparations for this climax we will see presently; for the moment let us turn the page and mark how the Second Book begins—

Motum ex Metello consule civicum...
tractas,—

the civil wars are become part of the past, and Pollio is writing

¹ Wickham, *Introduction* to Od. I.—
III.

² Note in I. 38 the time of year, 'scarce roses'—i.e. later autumn. The entry into Alexandria took place on

the first of August, the death of Cleopatra shortly after. Allowing time for the details to become known at Rome, I. 37 is dated about the end of the month or early in the next.

their history. Could there be a better way of denoting, if such was the poet's intention, that the division between these books is a historical symbol, and stands for the great land mark of all recollections, the boundary between the Wars and the Peace? But further, this limit is marked by another noticeable change. The earliest public badge of the new monarchy was the title of *Augustus*, assumed at the beginning of the year 27. It was indeed for some little time almost the only imperial thing in the empire. For the powers and privileges granted to Caesar after his victory, large as they were, and even for the union of them in a single hand, some sort of republican precedent might be made out. But the title of *Augustus* was entirely new and was chosen as *the* imperial designation on this account¹. This title does not occur in the First Book of the *Odes*, though several poems are occupied with the praises and fortunes of *Caesar*. It is introduced for the first time, and with emphasis, in the Second Book (II. 9, 18),

et potius nova
cantemus Augusti tropaea
Caesaris,

a passage of which there will be more to say hereafter. The formal conjunction here of the name and the title is unique; afterwards, either is used².

We have here, I submit, not indeed proof of a historical scheme but *prima facie* evidence that it may exist and ought to be looked for. We have found the necessary corner-stone, the date of the Revolution. The next question is whether the occasional poems of the First Book are such and so arranged as to fit the construction. The Book contains five poems which have the air of referring to some special event or time in the national history, namely, II., XII., XIV., XXXV. (with XXXIV. as preface), and XXXVII. The last, we have seen, gives us our terminal date of B.C. 30: what is the meaning and what are the dates of the other four? In presence of the various views

¹ Dion 53. 16. βουλευθέντων σφων
ιδίως πως αὐτὸν προσειπεῖν. Cf. Meri-
vale *History of the Romans under the*

Empire, Chap. 30.

² The name generally, the title twice
in the specially imperial Odes III. 1—6.

which have been propounded on each it would be impertinent to assume confidence. I will only say that the disagreement might have been less, had the poems been considered as parts of a possible chain. The following explanations,—all of which have been maintained independently by critics who were not even considering the plan of the work as a whole—seem to gain not a little when combined.

I. 2. Hopes and fears of the time between the overthrow of the regicides and that of Sextus Pompeius. (*Period* B.C. 40—36.) The sins of the nation, consummated and typified in the murder of Julius, have been enough punished; the eyes of all are upon Caesar (this as matter of history only partially true), the son of the gentle Maia, who has *submitted* to the part of avenger, as the destined minister of the national gods for the restoration of the State¹.

I. 12. Thanksgiving for the triumph of the national cause. (First establishment of Caesar's power by the submission of Lepidus and the overthrow of the pirate prince Sextus Pompeius, B.C. 36). The poet asks the historic Muse to whom the honours of the day are due, and answers himself that they are due, first to the gods and demi-gods, who hate and punish disorder (to show which their names and emblems are taken from the typical defeat of the Giants) and in whose hands is the rule of *seas and storms*; and secondly, to all the illustrious men *without distinction* (he is in doubt whom to choose first *v.* 33) who have helped to build up Rome, and whose memories are to be common inheritance of the reformed nation; to the warlike founder and the peaceful founder, to the representatives of stern government and indomitable liberty, to the patriots of all parties and all times (the Caesarean hymnist does not omit even the peculiarly 'optimiate' name of Scaurus), to the name of Marcellus (though borne by the last representatives of the senatorial régime) as well as to that of Julius (under which the democracy was victorious); all that is good in the

¹ See Page's edition of the *Odes* and Plüss, *Studien* p. 16. The remark of the last writer that if the poem be

severed from this period, its whole colour and meaning is "hopelessly lost", seems to me scarcely too strong.

Roman past triumphs in the triumph of Caesar, and Caesar (here the poet glances at the impieties attributed to Sextus and to Antonius) will not forget that he rules under God¹.

I. 14. Fear of renewed civil war and fresh peril to the national cause. Probability of rupture between Octavian and Antonius. *Period* B.C. 35—33².

I. 35 (the hymn to Fortuna). Fall of Antonius, B.C. 31—30. In the presence of that mysterious power, which strikes down princes in their pride, and standing as it were between the Ages, the national poet humbles himself for all the wickedness and folly of the civil wars (v. 34), and implores protection for the

¹ See Page's edition, and Plüss, *Studien* p. 77, an exposition full of interesting details, which if space permitted I would gladly translate entire. The repeated reference to winds, weather, and storms (vv. 10, 15, 27—32), points to the element on which the victory was won and the disasters which preceded it. Agrippa, who succeeded on this occasion when Caesar had failed, is not named—a politic omission for which Horace apologizes beforehand in I. 6—but he is not forgotten; note the emphasis on the fact that Rome had three times before found saviours in rough men of modest origin (vv. 41—44). The description of the glories of the name Marcellus 'growing like a tree whose time is hid' is carefully worded so as to admit an ominous interpretation. The allusion to the East is noticed hereafter. The juxtaposition of *Marcellus* and *Iulius* foreshadows of course the subsequent marriage, which like our own 'Marriage of the Roses' furthered the union of the two great parties, but was dissolved, with all the hopes which rested on it, by the hand of death before the collection was published. See *sup.* p. 60 note.

² For the tradition of Quintilian that this poem is a political allegory, see

the commentators. As to its date, while I agree with those who, judging without reference to the order, think we are without indication of it, there is no period so suitable as that which the present exposition of the book requires. The ship of state seemed to the impatient watcher to be coming safe into port, *not* to be arrived. The port is the national peace, which seemed to be almost attained by the union of Caesar and Antonius, and was attained after a final crisis by the victory of Caesar. The existence and acceptance among the Romans of the allegorical view is in itself an indication that the order of the poems in the collection was to them significant. Given this principle, it is easy enough to arrive at the perception, that the poem *has a date*, and is a political allegory; without it, not so; nor is it surprising that among modern readers, who have ignored the order as a means of interpretation, several weighty judgments have pronounced that Quintilian was mistaken and there is no allegory at all. For the disputed epithet *Pontica*, I believe it is merely meant to show that the ship has *come a long way*, and was probably suggested to Horace by Catullus iv.

new generation and for Caesar their leader, that the arms of Rome, so long turned against herself, may be carried victoriously against her enemies from East to West (Plüss, *Studien* pp. 6—10). I entirely agree with this author that the fall of Antonius is the tacit thought of this solemn and beautiful hymn, and supplies the link of connexion between its parts. The mention of the Britanni has turned the attention of expositors to the year 27, (and it is quite likely that the poem was not completed till then or later); but the description *ultimos orbis* and the antithesis of *Eois partibus* shows why the name is chosen; and indeed the conquest of Britain was a favourite object of popular imagination long before as well as after that particular year. The fall of Antonius, an incident not lightly to be omitted from the national drama of which Caesar was the hero, was at the same time a most delicate topic to handle. The victory of a Roman over a Roman, of Octavian over his brother-in-law, was no subject for mere exultation, not to mention that men who were Antonius' nearest friends and remained of his party as long as was decent or even safe, receive tribute of esteem from Horace in the *Odes* and elsewhere, and that Antonius' children held high places in Roman society and at the court. The feelings which he has chosen for expression and the form in which they are expressed are alike admirable in their fitness.

(There is one point which I would mention, because, though not important in itself, it may have had no small influence in directing the poet's thoughts. Between Antium and the family of Antonius there appears to have been some link, which our scanty remnants of history suggest without fully explaining. Whatever it was, his descendants were more than willing to recognise it. C. Caesar 'Caligula' who was the first of Antonius' blood to ascend the throne, who was partly educated by Antonius' daughter, and who held the profound opinion that his defeat was a public misfortune, treated Antium with such extreme partiality, that Suetonius infers he must have been born there¹. He was even accused of an intention

¹ Suet. *Caligula* 8 and 49. Suetonius supports his opinion against previous authorities by a somewhat vague and suspicious reference to cer-

to transfer the seat of government either to Alexandria¹ (which had been Antonius' capital) or to Antium!—a suspicion which reminds us significantly of the plan popularly attributed to Julius, of conferring the same honour upon Ilium, the legendary fatherland of the Julii. From the oracle of Fortuna at Antium Caligula was said to have received a warning against his murderers², a most Antonine warning, though unfortunately ambiguous, to 'beware of *Cassius*'. The emperor Nero, an Antonius by both parents, was born at Antium³, and one of his first acts as sovereign was to grant fresh honours and benefits to the town⁴. The triumvir himself traced his pedigree to an *Anteon* son of Hercules, and was proud of the connexion, as were his grandchildren after him. Now Cicero, in a letter to Octavian⁵, alludes in uncomplimentary terms to one whom he calls *Hercules Antianus*; "That the matter might not drag," he says, "we contrived to move *Hercules of Antium* to another place"; and it seems unlikely that at that time any one but Antonius should have been meant by the type of Hercules. Thus there is reason to think, that in connecting the fortune of Antonius with the Fortuna of Antium Horace follows a clue of association which some of his contemporaries could understand.)

After what was said at the beginning of this essay it is perhaps unnecessary to repeat that I do not assume these poems to have been composed at or even near the times to which they have been referred. Indeed in the case of the first two this is perfectly impossible. As Mr Wickham truly says, "Augustus did not then occupy the whole horizon of politics⁶". (Moreover the close resemblance of the first to a passage of Vergil on the same theme⁷ is to my mind best explained by deliberate imitation on the part of Horace). Like the poems on Murena, these also are, so to speak, ante-dated; they are pictures of the past coloured

tain 'acta', which if authentic would have made his other arguments superfluous.

¹ The *Alexandrea* meant must, as there is no specification, be the *Alexandrea*, not *Alex. Troas*.

² Suet. *Calig.*, 57.

³ Suet. *Nero* 6.

⁴ *ibid.* 9.

⁵ *fragment* 212. 6, ed. Nobbe.

⁶ Introduction to *Od.* i. 2.

⁷ *Georg.* i. 466 foll.

to suit the known sequel. This I believe to be the character of the *Odes* in general, so far as they relate to real events; and it is the key to many of their difficulties. The sketch of the decade 40—30 B.C. is precisely such as suits the facts seen from the tragic point of view suggested in II. 1, and suggested in a manner which instantly recalls I. 34, I. 35, and I. 37 to the mind.

Postponing for the moment the consideration of other points in the chronology of the First Book, and assuming that the end of the book gives us for point of departure the end of the civil wars, let us proceed to the remainder.

If we consider the broad movement of politics in the decade 30—20 as it appears in general history, we see that it had for the Roman public two chief epochs, the first return of Augustus from the East, his triumphs, and assumption of power in the years 29—28, and his second return after the Cantabrian war in the years 25—24, the two proclamations of universal peace. We shall observe that Horace has marked these two. The decade closed at Rome in disorder and anxiety, the emperor absent, the malcontents, under the leadership of Egnatius, conducting party contests almost on the scale of a street-war. We shall find that the series of political poems closes accordingly. But far more important to a lyric treatment than this wider history is the personal story in which the idea of the whole is reflected. The function of the Second Book is to bring upon the stage with suitable accompaniments the figure of Murena. It is, as noticed in the first essay, full of two thoughts, the vices of excess and the foreboding of death; and these thoughts are linked on the one hand with Murena by II. 10 and II. 18, on the other with the discontent of the defeated party in general by the names and topics of the various addresses. Pollio, who would not fight against Antonius, is meditating in his study the terrible lesson of the times (II. 1); Sallustius, next to Maecenas the emperor's chief confidant, is praised for his dislike of ostentation, with which is coupled significantly the first glance towards the 'brother of Proculeius' (II. 2); Pompeius, the old soldier of the regicide army, permitted by

'Jupiter' to re-enter his native land, is invited to be thankful, rest, and forget (II. 7), and so in different tones Dellius (II. 3) and Pompeius Grosphus, whose very name and Sicilian property point him out as by connexion a *Pompeian* (II. 16). Even the consolation offered to the poet Valgius for his elegiac woes is so turned as to suggest to anti-imperialist politicians the advice to let by-gones be by-gones and throw themselves heartily into the popular cause (II. 9).

In one respect the Second Book differs widely, and of course on the present view must differ, from the First. The political scene no longer shifts with the same rapidity. After the first poem, of which we have spoken already, there is not in the book any piece like the series we have followed hitherto, and scarcely so much as a political allusion. In the second we read of

redditum Cyri solio Phraaten,

which shall be considered hereafter with other allusions to the East. Besides this there is nothing definite but the passage already quoted—

desine mollium
tandem querellarum; et potius *nova*
cantemus Augusti tropaea
Caesaris, et rigidum Niphaten,
Medumque flumen, gentibus additum
victis, minores volvere vertices,
intraque praescriptum Gelonos
exiguus equitare campis¹.

Two points here seem certain, (1) that this language is intended to mark an approximate date, (2) that it is connected with that of Vergil in the *Georgics* (III. 30)

addam urbes Asiae domitas, pulsumque *Niphaten*,
fidentemque fuga Parthum versisque sagittis,
et duo rapta manu diverso ex hoste *tropaea*,
bisque triumphatas utroque ab littore gentes,

and that we should therefore seek a common explanation². Both passages have been referred by some to the events of the

¹ II. 9. 17.

² See Page *ad. loc.* I agree with him

that the words cannot fairly be explained as a poetical 'anticipation'.

year 30, by others to those of 20, the demonstration against the Parthians which resulted in the celebrated restoration of the standards. If there were a definite allusion here to the year 20, all idea of chronological arrangement, at least in the two later books, might be at once abandoned. But this explanation has created as much difficulty in Vergil, as I believe it to create in Horace. On the other hand, whatever Caesar really accomplished in the East during the years 30—29, he claimed to have ‘settled affairs’ in Parthia as well as in Roman Asia¹, and his exploits were treated at Rome as something more splendid even than the subjugation of Egypt². At the same time the tribes of the Danube, who had been annoying the Roman territory with incursions, were chastised by a lieutenant acting under his commission and in his name³. These events satisfy the language of Vergil and Horace as well as those of the year 20; better indeed, as the allusions want the characteristic mark of the later triumph, the restitution of the standards (*signa*) of Crassus. But in truth I do not think that in the passage of Horace any stress can be laid on the mere names of the conquered nations. The truly characteristic point, the point which would touch a Roman ear with far more force than these, is the full title of *Augustus Caesar*, introduced here for the first time and here only, and coupled with ‘trophies new’. It is as if one should now, in one of a series of historical poems, refer to ‘the new crown of our Indian Empress’. As this would carry our minds instantly to the administration of Lord Beaconsfield, so, and much more, the words of Horace would take his readers to *the* trophies of the new monarch, the splendid shows which marked his entrance into Rome after the crowning success. The poem thus places itself not very long after the triumphs of the year 29. To be precise, it should be not earlier than January in 27, when the title *Augustus* was formally assumed. This last point, however, cannot be pressed; even for a historian, for Dion Cassius, Caesar becomes Augustus

¹ Dion 51. 18.

αὐτὸν ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς θεοῖς ἐσγράφεσθαι κ.τ.λ.

² *ib.* 20 ἐγνώσθη...ἐπειδὴ τὰ περὶ τῶν

³ *ib.* 23. *fol.*

Πάρθων γράμματα ἤλθεν, ἔς τε τοὺς ὕμνους

when he becomes master of the world, and a poet could not be bound to greater accuracy¹.

Here, as a sequel to the accession, if we may so say, of Augustus, is placed the first scene in the story of Murena, a story which the society of Rome had terrible reason to remember. We have seen in the previous essay that the connexion thus indicated accords with what we know of the story from other sources. The second scene follows at a brief interval.

Two other poems in the book have dates, the seventh on the return of the poet's friend Pompeius, and the thirteenth on his own escape from the falling tree, but as it is improbable that either of these dates was known beyond an exceedingly small circle, they are for the present purpose immaterial. It is worth notice, however, that the references to the accident are arranged so as to assist the chronological effect. The reflexions of II. 13, which are obviously supposed to be made immediately after the event, precede II. 17, III. 4, and III. 8, which allude to it as an incident in the past².

There are no other dated pieces in the Second Book³. In

¹ The title may show that the poem was not composed before 27, but this is of no importance to us here.

² It has been argued from II. 17. 21 that the events there mentioned were contemporaneous. 'You recovered from dangerous illness just when I escaped the falling tree' (Wickham *Introd.* to II. 17). If so I. 20 and II. 13 cannot both be placed according to chronology. But Mr Page rightly avoids this inference—'Remember how *you* have been snatched from death itself, while *I* have had a similar miraculous escape' (*Introd.* to same Ode). The connexion of the events is mystical, and might be accounted for in many ways—as, if they both occurred on the same day of the month, or in the same year of the respective ages of the two persons, or

in the same month of the year, etc. etc. The escape of Horace occurred on the 1st of March, which may be the reason for his attributing it here to Faunus, who was associated with that day through the legend of the *ancilia* (Ovid, *Fast.* III. 259 *fol.*). As we do not know the date of Maecenas' recovery, the rest of the astrology is for us unintelligible.

³ I do not mean to imply any opinion as to when II. 6 and II. 11 were composed; but whatever the true conclusion, neither of these pieces has any date in the sense which concerns this essay. The language of II. 6. 2 and of II. 11. 1 might have been spoken (to take the narrowest limits) at any time between the years 29 and 24.

the Third there are two, the eighth and the fourteenth. The question as to the date of the eighth¹ turns on the lines

occidit Daci Cotisonis agmen:
 Medus infestus sibi luctuosus
 dissidet armis:
 servit Hispanae vetus hostis orae
 Cantaber, sera domitus catena:
 iam Scythae laxo meditantur aren
 cedere campis.

Now here again there is one point, and only one, which is of any importance to literary effect. When the Dacian Cotiso died or was overthrown does not seem to be now ascertainable, nor would it be worth considering if it were. With all our telegrams and special correspondents, what proportion of average readers could at this moment tell, without looking up their files, whether an allusion to the death of an Afghan potentate six or seven years ago was precisely right or not? The same applies *a fortiori* to the 'Medes' and 'Scyths'; indeed these are so vaguely drawn that, even if we can now ascertain some time which the descriptions would fit, they cannot have been meant to recall it. A negative is indeed implied in the reference to the East, as will appear immediately, and that is all. But the Spanish allusion is a different thing. The Cantabrian war took place in Roman territory, in a country with which the inhabitants of Rome had perpetual communication, and the conclusion of it was marked at Rome by memorable demonstrations.

Let us notice first (for it is really the point of most importance) that Horace's story of the Cantabrian has its own consistent chronology. In II. 6 he is 'untaught to bear our yoke', in II. 11 he is 'plotting war', here in III. 8 he is 'tamed with a tardy chain'. Next, would the poem, taken in connexion with the rest of the work, convey to a Roman, reading it about the year 19, the remembrance of a definite time? I think it certainly would.

Revolts of the Cantabri, more or less serious, occurred

¹ Cf. Wickham *Introd.* I §§ 6 and 7.

repeatedly in the decade 30—20; they were subdued by Statilius Taurus at some time after the beginning of 29, by Augustus and various generals acting under him in 26—25, by L. Æmilius, governor of the district, in 24, by the governors Furnius and Carisius in 22, and finally, with extreme severity, by Agrippa in 20—19.¹ That the last event, nearly contemporaneous with the completion of the *Odes*, is not the subject of the above allusion is shown by the reference to the state of the East, which in 19 would have had a very different complexion². (Moreover we shall see eventually that an allusion to the Eastern campaign of 20 would be inconsistent with the whole design.) The others are of vastly unequal magnitude. All we know of the hostilities repressed by Statilius is that at the time they were not thought worthy to be called war, and the temple of Janus was accordingly closed notwithstanding their continuance. The disturbances of 24 and 22 were brief and of no general importance. On the other hand the insurrection suppressed in 25 was a war on a large scale; it disconcerted the long-projected invasion of Britain, it was the chief occupation of the Roman arms for more than a year, the temple of Janus stood open while it continued and was closed upon its suppression, and a triumph³ was voted to the emperor. The effect of the Spanish history as seen in perspective, is given by Velleius (II. 90), '*Hispaniae, nunc ipsius (Augusti) praesentia, nunc Agrippae, multo varioque bello pacatae.*' These facts, though they do not determine at all when Horace's poem was written, seem almost conclusive as to its *ostensible* date. Horace, speaking as if on a certain first of March, lays stress upon the general security and in particular on the subjugation of the Cantabri; in the spring of 25 the Cantabrian war was ending and a general peace was soon afterwards proclaimed. Judging from Dion Cassius, it would seem that Horace has put the end rather too early, but the same

¹ Dion 51. 20, 53. 22 *fol.*, 53. 29, 54. 5, 54. 11.

² Contrast the note of date in *Epist.* I. 12, 26 (B.C. 19).

³ Not celebrated. The refusal was in accordance with Augustus' usual practice, after he became sovereign.

narrative shows why. *The emperor* abandoned the field, from the state of his health, in 25; that the war was then substantially finished was probably believed in Rome, and at any rate would be a polite assumption. There is no other time (the spring of 19 or the spring of 18 being here out of the question) at which the pacification of the Spanish tribes was prominent in the political view. It will be remarked that the poet's assurances of safety are decidedly premature, as he and his readers had good reason to know, if the *Odes* were completed and put forth about the time of Agrippa's bloody campaign. When we consider to whom the poem is addressed and what were the experiences which awaited Maecenas in the sequel, this circumstance may appear not immaterial to the effect intended¹.

The date of III. 8, then, is at the close of the Cantabrian war and presumably before the return of the emperor, for the importance assigned to the minister has made all readers look for a date in the absence of the master. Upon this follows naturally III. 14, which is dated as on the day of his entrance into Rome. Taking the two poems and the intermediate notes of time together, we should suppose that the return did not take place till the spring or summer of 24, and with this agrees the account of Dion, who places it in that year and mentions that it was 'delayed' by the emperor's sickness².

¹ Mr Wickham, inquiring for the date of composition, concludes in an alternative between 29 and 25. He remarks that 'as each conquest would be thought final till the next rising, there is nothing in the words *servit Hispanae* etc. to fix them necessarily to a single date'. This is true, nor should I attempt to fix the date of writing more nearly in this case than any other—the poem was in writing between the years 29 and 19. But when we ask, what date would it *seem* to bear when published in the year 19, the question has a different complexion and does, I think, admit a precise an-

swer. The termination of the Cantabrian war was the most memorable date since the establishment of the monarchy, and to this the words of the poet would instantly carry the reader's imagination. In a book published in 1818 'the coming of the Peace' would mean *prima facie* 1815, not 1814 or 1802; in a review of the present century published now 'the year of the Great Exhibition' would mean *prima facie* '51, not '62 or '71. It is a matter of historical perspective.

² Orelli (on III. 14) places the arrival at Rome 'aut anno 729 exeunte, aut 730 ineunte'. Dion is not only clear

This is the last poem in the work which is dated precisely by allusions to public history which we know. The language of III. 24, in which the emperor is implored to use the severity necessary for the preservation of order, and to disregard the reproaches and complaints of those who will not perceive the necessity, answers exactly, as I have tried to show¹, to the historical account of the state of Rome between the autumn of 22 and the spring of 19. III. 29 (the last before the epilogue) suggests in the same manner as III. 8 the absence of the monarch from the capital; he quitted Rome for the East in 22 and had not returned at the time when we have supposed the collection to have been completed. The climax of Murena's career (III. 19) is also placed where we should expect to find it. Neither III. 29 however nor III. 24 is precisely dated: III. 19 is; I mean that contemporary readers, who remembered the trial of the conspirators, probably knew the assumed day perfectly well; but as we do not, no argument can be founded upon it². The famous six odes in praise of the imperial government and policy with which the book commences, the 'Römer-Oden' as they are sometimes called, have no mark of date other than their specially imperial character. Indeed a precise date would be inconsistent with their tone: in them the speaker is scarcely the actual Horace, the friend of Pompeius and lover of Cinara, but a transfigured Horace, an inspired priest of the Muses, to

for the latter year, but implies that it was long enough after the commencement to allow of a previous interchange of despatches between the emperor and the senate. Indeed from the place at which he introduces the revolt of the Cantabri against the governor Aemilius "immediately after Augustus had left Iberia", it would be supposed that at the beginning of the year the emperor had not left. Orelli's doubt seems to be founded on the list of Augustus' consulships in Sueton. *Aug.* 26, where it is implied that he 'entered on' the tenth (B.C. 24) at Rome. But as to dates the continuous narrative of Dion

is a better authority than the disconnected notices of Suetonius. At all events the chronology of Horace is consistent with itself, which is the thing of chief importance to literary effect.

¹ p. 32.

² From Ovid *Metamorph.* i. 160 foll. (note especially 165, 197, 200—205 and *vide sup.* p. 66), it appears that one of the conspiracies against Augustus was connected with a banquet, the facts respecting which caused much 'sensation' when disclosed by him to the senate and the public. Unfortunately it is impossible to fix Ovid's allusion more precisely.

whom the future world is as the present (III. 3. 11), and who is the subject of such legends as were told of the ancient Hellenic bards (III. 1. 1, III. 4. 9). From III. 4 and III. 5 we do indeed obtain important and in my judgment decisive evidence as to the earliest possible time of their composition; the writer, as has been already said¹, either knew or foresaw the events of the years 23—22. But they are not dated poems in the sense in which III. 14 is a dated poem. It does not of course follow that their place in the work, viewed chronologically, is of no significance. On the contrary, it gives to their enigmatic allusions the effect of a prophecy.

To sum up this, I fear somewhat tedious, review. The period covered by the Three Books extends over about twenty years from B.C. 40—20. The cardinal epoch is the end of the civil wars, marked by the end of Book I. The political poems of Book I. describe the phases of the decade 40—30, and present Caesar as the coming saviour of the state. In the second decade two dates are marked, the constitution of the monarchy, notified by the assumption of the title of *Augustus*, and the close of the Cantabrian war, the two leading dates in the period as presented by the historians. The first, the date of transition, is placed in Book II, otherwise chiefly of a personal and non-political character. Book III. is the book of the monarchy, the separation of it from the Second serving chiefly to throw into prominence the six imperial odes. Into this frame are fitted in their appropriate places the poems on the story of Murena, the quasi-political addresses to Maecenas as minister for Augustus (III. 8 and III. 29) and a poem (III. 24) on the social and political state of Rome at the time of the final collection.

From allusions to events in the private life of Horace little can be expected. As the dates of them would not be present to the minds of his readers, it would not signify to the chronological effect whether they were placed rightly or wrongly, provided the arrangement were consistent with itself. But it may be worth notice that on one subject of interest to the poet

¹ p. 57.

and the patron, and known to all readers of the *Satires*, the establishment of Horace at the Sabine farm, the *Odes* are in agreement with our other evidence. The rural felicity of the Sabine hills is celebrated in two poems of a peculiar character (I. 17, the first allusion to the subject, and I. 22), fanciful idylls in which 'Horace' figures as the shepherd of an Italian *Arcady*. With them is grouped a real invitation of Maecenas to the farm (I. 20). The three are the only poems, except the conclusion (III. 29), in which the 'Sabine' scene is important, and their proximity, by whatever cause determined, gives a special colour to this part of the work. The presentation of the farm has been fixed within the years 34—32¹; and according to the above scheme I. 17, I. 20, and I. 22 fall precisely into this period.

But there is a way of conveying to the reader the general idea of sequence, much more effective in a series of lyrics than allusions even the most familiar to dates in public or private history—and that is the progression of the seasons².

Now not only are the several poems in the *Odes* so constructed as to keep the seasons of the year constantly before the mind, but from the very outset of the work the general notion of a *progression* from poem to poem is suggested. The first poem which has a clear mark of season is I. 4, which 'opens the year' appropriately with the spring—

solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni.

In I. 5 we pass to summer, the 'plenteous rose', 'pleasant grot' and treacherous summer sea. In I. 7 we are in autumn with the orchards of Tibur and the rainy wind of *Notus*³. In I. 8 the athlete, grown luxurious, fears the touch of the cold river⁴. I. 9 in the dead of winter completes the round of the year. It has been already noticed that in I. 38 the 'last rose'

¹ See Maclean *Life of Horace*, and the commentaries on I. 17, II. 18, *Epod.* I. etc.

² Here again the case of *In Memoriam* is exactly in point.

³ Cf. III. 7. 5. *Epod.* IX. 31.

⁴ That it is the exposure to cold in

athletic exercises from which he shrinks is shown by the comparison of the oil to *sanguis viperinus*, cf. ὁ ψυχρὸς ὄφις in Greek. The epithet *apricus* in v. 3 points to the same thing. See Essay V. and the end of the last Essay.

shows the time of year to which the history has been brought down. From the mere extent of time covered by Book I. it follows that the series is not complete or supposed to be. Between I. 12 and I. 37 there is a space of six years. To fill up this space with seasons, even if every poem had been devoted to the purpose, would have doubled or trebled the actual length. It is enough that the idea of progression is revived from time to time, as when the summer scene of I. 17 is followed in I. 18 by the planting of the vine, or the autumnal colour of I. 25. 19 leads up to the wintry touches of I. 26¹. In Book II. the observance of the same principle, by marking the flight of time, adds very much to the ominous tone which is there dominant. In II. 3 we are with the roses of summer. In II. 5 the grape is ripening but not ripe. In II. 6 the poet is looking wistfully towards the delicate Tarentum 'where spring is long and winter warm', and in II. 7 the roses are still away, for myrtle and 'apium' are in request for the highest purposes of festivity². But in II. 9 and II. 10 we are reminded that neither the wind and the rain, which strip the ash of its leaves, nor 'beauty-lacking winter' last for ever in the natural order; and in II. 11, a poem with many points of resemblance to II. 3, we are with the roses again. It must be allowed that in a work so planned there is more force than the words themselves convey in such an opening as

Eheu fugaces Postume, Postume,
labuntur anni.

But it is in Book III. and in the approach to the tragic climax of III. 19 that this method has the greatest importance. During the 'Six Odes' there is of course no progress. For the same reason that these poems have no date and no address, they have no season either. They are above and out of the transitory scene. But at III. 7 we recommence the series, very much in the same manner as at I. 4, though a little earlier in season—

¹ For the force of the epithet in preceding note.
apricos flores see the references in the

² Cf. iv. 11, and see p. 35.

Quid fles, Asterie, quem tibi candidi
primo restituent vere Favonii.

We are in winter and looking forward to spring. From this time to the banquet of Murena the calendar is followed with increasing closeness. III. 8 brings us to March; III. 10 to the snowy *Aquilones* of November¹; III. 12 round again to the same season as in III. 7, the athletic season of hunting and riding, when open air bathing is a noticeable feat²; III. 13 and III. 15 to the heat and roses of summer; III. 16 (see *v.* 30) to the prospect of harvest; III. 17 to the rains of autumn and the fall of the leaf; III. 18 (here the sequence becomes extremely close) to December 5, III. 19 to the *nova luna* or *νοῦμηνία*, the commencement of the year³.

But further there are pieces which, though they have no

¹ Plin. *Hist. Nat.* II. 47 and 48.

² Compare III. 12. 7 with III. 7. 28 and both with I. 8. 8. These references to bathing in the Tiber as an *athletic* exercise are all alike and all refer to the winter season. In III. 7 and III. 12 it is a proof of manly vigour, in I. 8 a quondam athlete is reproached for avoiding it. For the hunting see I. 1. 25, Martial I. 49 (50), 19—30.

³ The opinion of those, who have interpreted *nova luna* as the first day of a year as well as of a month, is confirmed by III. 23, which, as it seems to me, would lose half its point if the sacrifice offered *nascente luna* were not made for the year. The day alluded to in III. 19 seems to be shortly before the conspiracy, either the 1st of January in the year 22, or perhaps rather the 1st of March, the religious day of commencement and according to the mythical calendar just after the anniversary of the *regifugium* (Ov. *Fast.* II. 683. See the allusions in the opening of III. 19). It will be observed that in the epilogue Horace, in claiming the wreath of Melpomene, glances at

the ceremonies of this day, when the laurels of the *pontifex* and of *Vesta* were renewed for the year (Ov. *Fast.* III. 139 Cf. *Od.* III. 30. 5, 8 and 16). The fact that at the beginning of the year 22 the emperor with two assistants executed the office of censor (Dion 54. 1) accounts for the celebration in honour of Murena's senatorial decoration, whether he was then *first* admitted or not. I hope to show in a subsequent essay that this is confirmed by III. 17. It should be noticed that for strict correspondence with history Horace here (as in Book I.) has not seasons enough. Between the return of Augustus and the conspiracy there is a year more than the series translated into dates would suggest. But this sort of inaccuracy is of no literary importance, so long as the dramatic relation of events is observed and the general outline of history followed. For dramatic effect a close sequence in representation between the return of the emperor and the fatal banquet is essential, and a real year may be interpolated by the imagination anywhere.

internal date and afford therefore no direct support to the supposition of a chronological scheme, nevertheless gain something from it and are so far to be counted in its favour,—for example I. 6, which is thereby placed before the year 36. At that time the chief triumphs of Agrippa were still to come, and it might have passed for a compliment to say in language of vague anticipation,

scriberis Vario fortis et hostium
victor Maeonii carminis alite,
quam rem cunque ferox *navibus aut equis*
miles te duce *gesserit*¹.

At that time Horace was making his earliest experiments in literature and had published probably nothing, certainly nothing to prove himself worthy of heroic themes. The date gives his excuses at least the appearance of truth. That they are not actually sincere remains still too plain. It is true, Horace to the last protests that his Muse will not 'talk battles' (IV. 15, 1), but the author of I. 37, II. 1, III. 3, III. 4, *etc.* could, if he had chosen, have done something better than I. 6 for the victor of Naulochus and Actium. The ingenuity of his apology has been much praised; and certainly, assuming that the poem is dated, it does fairly avoid the dilemma presented by the unique position of Agrippa in the empire, the equal and yet not the equal of the monarch, the father of the heir yet not in the succession, a personage inconvenient either to extol or to neglect. Unless the date be given, silence, if less ingenious, would have been more polite.

Very much the same applies to I. 7, which is thrown back into a time when Plancus really was 'in the glittering camp' (see *v.* 20), and not, as when Horace published, in the 'shade' of Tibur and of an ambiguous position in politics. In fact this poem does within certain limits date itself, for few things are more certain in the history of the period than that

¹ Sometimes taken as a perfect subjunctive, but sentiment and grammar surely require the future. Naulochus and Actium were the saving of Rome. Could any poet in an address

to Wellington have described the Peninsular War as "whatsoever your arms have achieved"? The subjunctive indeed seems doubtful Latin.

Plancus had no military employment after the civil wars. In spite of his well-timed abandonment of Antonius, the imperialists regarded him, as Velleius shows, with peculiar hatred and distrust.

So also, with the help of a date, it is easy to see the point and connexion of I. 31 and I. 32. The first of these, a poet's prayer to a newly dedicated Apollo, has been connected with the Palatine temple dedicated in memory of the battle of Actium in B. C. 28; but the selection of this ceremony is arbitrary and indeed, apart from the place of the poem, demonstrably inappropriate. It contains no reference to the emperor, to Actium, to the Palatium or the Palatine, or in short to any of the topics proper to the supposed occasion¹. In truth the worship of Apollo was in such special honour throughout Augustus' career, that on its own evidence the poem could not be dated at all. Five or six celebrated statues of the god are mentioned in the description of works belonging to the period. But taken together with the next piece, and considered with regard to its place, it explains itself. The two poems are correlated by their commencements²; on the one hand the demand which the poet makes of the patron-god,—

Quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem
vates?

on the other hand, a demand made of the poet, and connected with the honour of the god, that he should address his lyre no longer to trifling, but to the production of *Latin song worthy to live*, something 'Apolline dignum' as the poet says elsewhere,—

Poscimur. Si quid vacui sub umbra
lusinus tecum, quod et hunc in annum
vivat et plures, age, dic Latinum,
barbite, carmen³...
o decus Phoebi et dapibus supremi
grata testudo Jovis etc.

¹ Contrast Propertius' poem on the subject (III. 29).

² I have seen this antithesis pointed out, but cannot now find by whom.

³ On the disputed construction of

quod...plures see the commentaries. The solution is, I think, that it is understood both of the *lusus* and the *carmen*. It seems implied that the *lusus* were *Greek verses*, a favourite

It is surely most natural to connect this 'demand' for a truly national lyric poetry with the establishment of *the first* national library, that built by Asinius Pollio. That this, like the subsequent Palatine and Octavian libraries, was decorated with a statue of the patron of learning cannot indeed be independently proved, as we have no description of it, but apart from this passage would be exceedingly probable. Now the library of Pollio was finished certainly before Actium and probably, from a notice in Dion Cassius, about the year 33, a date corresponding precisely to the position of these poems¹.

So again the place of I. 11 shews that there is real sense in the words

seu plures hiemes seu tribuit Jupiter ultimam
quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare
Tyrrhenum.

With what truth or point can it be said of winter in general that it 'breaks the power of the sea' with 'frail stones set against it'? But the winter of 37—36 literally did this, for Agrippa had then just completed the great breakwater of the Portus Iulius,

literary amusement of the time, or at all events mere translations. Horace may have thought his own not unworthy of preservation for *some years*. The answer to the 'demand' is the Book of Odes.

¹ Under the year 33 Dion writes (43. 49) ἐπειδὴ τε οἱ Δελμάται παντελῶς ἐκεχείρωντο, τὰς τε στοὰς ἀπὸ τῶν λαφύρων αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας τῶν βιβλίων τὰς Ὀκταονίαντας ἐπὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ κληθείσας κατεσκεύασεν [ὁ Καῖσαρ]. At first sight this seems mere blundering, for the great library in the buildings named after Octavia was not dedicated till more than ten years afterwards. (There is also apparently a confusion which does not here concern us, between the *Porticus Octavii* and the *Porticus Octaviae*.) But the error requires explanation,

and the supposition above made explains it fully. The library of Pollio was built 'out of the spoils of the Dalmatians.' The attribution of it to Octavian instead of his coadjutor is not more than a verbal inaccuracy: in the conception of Dion, the *princeps* does everything which is done. Even τὰς Ὀκταονίαντας may be practically right. It is a very curious fact that none of our copious informants on the work of the period (Pliny, Vitruvius, etc.), give any separate description of a building so interesting as the first library in Rome (Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, Introd. p. lii), though they mention it and frequently refer to the founder. It would account for this, if in the great reconstructions of Augustus the building was in fact absorbed, in which case Dion is merely anticipating.

Iulia qua ponto longe sonat unda refuso,
 Tyrrhenusque fretis immittitur aestus Avernis¹,

a work which, by serving for the construction and repairs of his fleet, largely contributed to his momentous victory in the following autumn. I. 11 is therefore the natural preface to I. 12.

Further, it is perhaps possible from this point of vantage to cast a gleam—where assuredly it is wanted—on the meaning and purpose of III. 25, the dithyramb in miniature *Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui plenum?* This poem is, as critics say in various tones of defence or disparagement, a preface to nothing. Its sublime vacuity is ridiculous in itself, and more so from the setting. The glory of Caesar fills the bard with a Dionysian rapture; he *will* celebrate it with no mere mortal utterance as he follows in the train of the god. What comes of this inspiration? Nothing whatever. The next piece, in which the ‘ladies’ man’ takes farewell of his lyre and other weapons of love, is a complete bathos; and neither Caesar nor any subject of national interest is afterwards mentioned.

This bathos has, in fact, been accepted as intentional, and illustrated by other cases supposed similar². But I do not find elsewhere in the *Odes* any desire to treat the praises of Caesar with irony. And further we might ask, if the poet’s raptures are for Caesar the *princeps*, what is the sense—even a dithyramb should have sense—of saying that the glory of Caesar is a ‘fresh theme’? This is indeed all that he has to say of it. It is the novelty of the theme which overpowers him. It is emphatically *insigne, recens, adhuc indictum ore alio*. He is off the beaten road and in a forest unvisited. *Egregius Caesar* a fresh theme, spoken by no other lip before! Had it not been celebrated in floods of prose and verse as long as most men could well remember? Had not ‘Caesar’ been complimented (and satirised too) as ‘*unicus imperator*’ when Horace was at school? The praise of *Augustus*, though not very new when the *Odes*

¹ Georg. II. 161, see Merivale *Hist. of the Romans*, chap. xxvii.

² The juxtaposition of I. 12—I. 13, I. 24—I. 25, III. 6—III. 7. I must

leave it to the reader whether these parallels are satisfactory. II. 19 is not treated in this fashion.

appeared, was not yet so trite; but Horace does not write *Augustus*, though he is perfectly conscious of the difference between the name and the title, and always uses them with discrimination. This is the kind of pointless fiction which makes so many murmur that after all Horace was no poet¹. But if we consider the date of the piece, that we are, as the preceding poem shows, somewhere about the year 20; and if we attend to the preparatory suggestions of III. 22, where the poet gives thanks for the safe delivery of a mother (a noticeable thing surely in the work of a bachelor), and of the conclusion to III. 24, where the degeneracy of the age is traced to mis-employment of childhood, and the poet demands a more stern and fortifying nurture for the rising heirs; then it may cross our minds, that there was at this time a member of the Caesarean house, a most 'unique Caesar', whose glory was indeed a theme unsung, a theme of which only the prologue was yet possible, and one quite proper for playful treatment,—the infant son of Julia, sole heir of Julius, Augustus, and Rome. Now Bacchus is the typical god of infancy and infant nurture². The Nymphs (the Naiads of the poem) the Bacchae, Lenae, Euiades and so forth, are his nurses. He has his toys, which were exhibited in the mysteries. Hermes watches over his rearing and carries him yet a babe to heaven—a part of ancient religious symbolism now made most living to us by the recovery of the masterpiece in which it was represented by Praxiteles. What then more suitable, than that on this auspicious birth, which promised to give Caesar perpetuity, Horace, as one born under the merry star of Mercurius³, should exclaim

quibus
antris egregii Caesaris audiar
aeternum meditans decus
stellis inserere et consilio Iovis?

¹ Thus a recent critic has said of the Dionysian vision (II. 19), very unjustly as I think, that it is 'little more than mythological exercise'. II. 19 is forced perhaps, but not futile; it is a vision of eternal power over nature

and death expressed in such forms as poetry knew, and stands just where it ought.

² See Smith *Dict. Biog.* 'Dionysus'.

³ II. 17. 29.

or that he should hymn the destinies of the infant in a prefatory dithyramb altogether proportioned to his size? And we may add that, as the *Odes* are not a work in which phrases are selected at hazard, it is presumably no mere coincidence that in his address to Agrippa, the father of the little Gaius, he has described the future Augustus—

laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas—

so as to link together by anticipation the praises of the parent and the child (l. 6).

I have purposely deferred for separate consideration the allusions to the affairs of Asia. For it is obvious that from a literary point of view there is the widest difference between these and such as have been treated above. Even supposing (an impossible supposition, as we shall see) that Horace had an accurate knowledge of the wars and diplomacy of the Parthians, Scythians, and Chinese, precision in these matters would have been lost upon his readers. For a poetic chronology it was worth while to start from the avenging of Julius, to place the fall of Antonius and Cleopatra at the close of the civil wars, to mark the new title of Augustus and the return from Spain, because these were epochs conspicuously marked at Rome and fixed in the public memory. In Oriental affairs none but the broadest effects could tell. As long as we keep to these, and compare the allusions of Horace only with such history of the East as may be supposed to represent the common ideas of the Romans, everything is simple. First we have the general contrast between the disasters of Crassus and Antonius and the triumph of Caesar, between the fears which preceded the revolution and the security which followed it¹. Upon this contrast Horace is explicit. The First Book is all anxieties—‘the Mede unpunished’, ‘the Parthian hanging over Latium’, ‘the Mede terrible’; not to talk of ‘the Parthian’ is a singular mark of absorption; all men are watching a Parthian crisis with ‘gloom and apprehension’. Augustus appears, and everything is changed. The ‘Median river’ figuring among the symbols

¹ Velleius II. 91, and Dion *passim*.

of Roman victory, 'rolls a humbler wave'; the Mede is at war with himself, so is the Scythian; these distant affairs should not cause anxiety even to a minister; and the poet confidently expects a still fuller revenge for former humiliations¹. The two allusions which have a more definite character are consistent with one another and with the Roman histories. In i. 26 (that is, about the year 33), Tiridates, the rebel who for a time dethroned king Phraates of Parthia, is in terror. In ii. 2 (that is, after the year 30) Phraates is on his throne again. According to Dion the rebellion of Tiridates took place before the close of the civil war, and Phraates was left in possession by Caesar when he returned from the 'settlement of Parthia' to assume his empire². The agreement is perfect.

But modern research has lights on the affairs of Asia very different from those of Horace or Dion or the Latin authorities whom Dion followed—special histories of Parthia, Parthian coins, accurate maps, Chinese histories; and this evidence appears to show, what is not surprising, that the poet and Dion had at best a very hazy notion of the subject. By the great kindness of Prof. Robertson Smith I have been able to compare the very latest conclusions of modern scholarship. The true facts seem to be briefly these—Tiridates first became or claimed to be king about the year 33, and *was* expelled, as Dion says, in 30; but this was not the true crisis of his career. He in turn expelled Phraates and seated himself on the throne in June, 27; but Phraates obtained the help of a vast host of 'Scythians' from central Asia, and was restored by them not later than June, 26. (The movements of these Scythians were much influenced by the Chinese, a fact extremely interesting

¹ See i. 2, i. 12, i. 19, i. 26, i. 29, ii. 9, iii. 5, iii. 8, iii. 29.

² 51. 18. Tiridates, according to Dion, was granted residence in Syria. In or before 23, in consequence of mutual complaints, Tiridates came in person to Augustus (at Rome) and Phraates sent ambassadors. Augustus refused to surrender Tiridates, but re-

stored a son of Phraates whom he had taken as hostage, demanding the standards of Crassus in return, which Phraates actually restored when the emperor approached his dominions in the year 20 (Dion 53. 33, 54. 8). Contrast this with the modern account given above.

to the students of Horace, as showing that when he mentions 'the designs of the *Seres* and of *Bactra*' among the cares of a Roman statesman, he is resting on fact and not on mere poetic imagination)¹. Now this account would show that Dion, with Livy before him, has simply omitted what from an Asiatic point of view must be called the chief part of the story; for under the years 29—24 he relates nothing of the Parthians, and he ignores the part of the Scythians altogether. It is therefore not strange to find that the poet, if more complete, is utterly confused; and that when in a poem which should refer to Tiridates' first rebellion he brings in 'the king of the cold north'—

quis sub Arcto
rex gelidae metuatur orae,
quid Tiridaten terreat—

he is consciously or unconsciously borrowing touches which belong only to the subsequent reign of Tiridates and the second expulsion².

Altogether, even with our scanty knowledge of the political and military history, our almost entire ignorance of the social history, and our consequent liability to miss much that was intelligible to contemporaries, there is a strong case for the historical arrangement. It remains to enquire what can be said against it.

¹ Article (in proof) on the Parthian empire in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed. vol. XVIII. Art. PERSIA, by Prof. v. Gutschmid of Tübingen.

² Prof. v. Gutschmid, as I gather, thinks it possible to date the composition of pieces in the *Odes* by these Oriental allusions: those of III. 29 for example would correspond to the state of affairs just before the Scythian invasion; those of III. 8 would have been appropriate in the spring of 26. There is nothing to show that these passages were not first written at the times suggested, though it might be doubted whether Horace can have been

consciously accurate in the affairs of Central Asia. (Indeed his expressions look as if he did not really understand who these 'Scythians' were, or what was their geographical relation to Parthia.) Of course it could not be inferred that the poems as they stand were written then; and this is in the case of III. 29 extremely improbable. However, the question is not here material. For literary purposes and from the point of view of the general Roman reader the language is too vague to suggest any date and therefore has no bearing on the chronology of the complete work.

One objection will perhaps have been made and answered by the reader long ago. The voyage of Vergil is the latest event mentioned; I. 3 therefore is nearly as far as possible from its right place. It is; but wherever placed it could have no chronological effect. The events which Horace has used for his framework were notorious from Tarsus to Gades; the 'peritus Iber Rhodanique potor' had the key ready in their memory. All Rome and Italy had witnessed the splendour and fall of Murena. Even the 'Sabine farm' and the circumstances of the gift were known as far as Utica and Ilerda, if the *Satires* went the way which Horace anticipates for the *Epistles*. But Vergil neither lived nor wrote his life for the public eye; and with all his fame, it may be doubted from modern analogy if a hundred persons living knew when he went to Athens, or whether he had been there at all. His services to the nation and to Horace account for his place in the work; and affection apart, the author of *Iam satis terris* had a motive for showing without delay his right to borrow freely from Vergil.

The same applies to I. 24, assuming that we are certain of the date commemorated. Of Quintilius Varus we know scarcely anything but what the poem tells us, that he was the friend of Vergil and Horace; nor does it appear that the scholars of antiquity could discover more, for in the *Chronicon* of Jerome he is merely *Vergilii et Horatii familiaris*. If his death occurred in 24, as the *Chronicon* says, and if Horace has placed his dirge so as to suggest that it was nine or ten years earlier, how many, on reading the *Odes* in 19, would perceive the discrepancy? But in fact the date is extremely uncertain. The proof is an unconfirmed statement, as to a matter of little interest, in a work compiled three centuries later and injured in transmission to us. If it were necessary to the chronology of the *Odes* to believe that Quintilius died in 34, that date would have evidence better than the MSS. of Jerome and Eusebius.

II. 4 has no date at all, the subject and all the persons, including the speaker, being, for anything that appears to the contrary, pure fiction. To date it after 25 by the words

cuius octavum trepidavit actas
claudere lustrum

involves a 'circular' argument. If the poem showed Horace to be the speaker, the age of the speaker would date it; or if again it were independently dated about December B.C. 25, the age of the speaker would be some reason for identifying him with Horace and supposing the poem to have a real foundation. As it is there is neither reality nor date.

I. 29 has been connected with the Arabian expedition of Aelius Gallus in 24, but the evidence is scarcely worth discussion. There were conquests or pretended conquests in Arabia long before this; for instance it is mentioned that Antonius assumed to estate his children with grants in that region¹. The language of terror, in which the great eastern enemy, the *horribilis Medus*, is spoken of, fits much better with the time when the disaster of Antonius in 36 and the futile attempts to repair it were fresh in the Roman mind than with any time after Augustus had, as his subjects chose to believe, "settled the affairs" of the Parthians and "added to his conquests the river of the Medes".

The reader has now the whole case, so far as I can discover it, both for and against the view that the scheme of the Three Books is determined in the main outlines by the history of the period to which they refer. The discussion is longer than I wished; but my excuse must be that, if this view has been considered previously (though I do not know that it has), the discussion has left no trace on the exposition of the poet. Investigations of date have been directed not to the relations of the entire work but to the composition of its different parts, an enquiry which has perhaps kept the other out of sight².

¹ Dion 49. 32.

² It has often been pointed out that I. 3 throws curious light on the poet's method of composition. It has all the appearance of an occasional poem on Vergil's voyage, and as Prof. Sellar remarks, is excellently adapted to its subject. But on examination four-fifths of it are seen to be pure commonplace,

which might have been written at any time; and it seems probable that in reality the subject has been tacked to the poem. So with I. 1 and others. In seeking to know when a particular poem (as distinct from the whole work) was finished, we are probably asking what Horace himself could not easily have answered.

LAMIA.

THE name *Lamia*, if we include the description *vetusto nobilis ab Lamo* in Od. III. 17, occurs in Horace five times. Among the various kinds of name which are introduced in the *Odes*, *Lamia* belongs to a peculiar class—it is both a Greek word and name and, by adoption, a Roman name, like *Grosphus* (a javelin), for example, or *Musa* in the names *Pompeius Grosphus* and *Antonius Musa* respectively. In Greek the Λάμια was a kind of vampire-snake supposed to suck the blood of men. Like Μόρμω, Ἐμπουσα, and other such, the word was a suitable nickname for a certain class, and was in fact best known as the name of the too notorious beauty, who spent the plunder of Demetrius Poliorcetes¹. In a Roman writer it might, like Μούσα or *Musa* itself, be the name of a real person of either sex, belonging to the servile or freedman class. It may also, of course, in Horace, be a fictitious Greek name chosen, either at hazard or, as is often the case², for its history or signification, to designate a purely imaginary personage whom the reader is not intended to identify. But besides these there is another possibility, which, as it happens, seems to have had hitherto exclusive attention.

Lamia, like many words both Greek and Latin as little or less elegant in original signification, was the cognomen of a Roman family; whether the family was widely diffused does not appear, nor at what time it first became notorious; but in the first two reigns of the empire one member of it rose to the

¹ See Smith's *Dict. Biog.* Keats' poem *Lamia* is founded on a similar use of the word. Cf. *Ars Poet.* 340.

² See Wickham's edition of the *Odes*, Appendix 1.

highest rank, a L. Aelius Lamia, who ten years after the death of Horace became consul and later still, under Tiberius, praefect of the city. How the family came by the addition, whether, as so used, the word had any connexion with the Greek *Λάμια*, we cannot say. There is evidence that these *Aelii* were of good position in the last days of the republic. Tacitus ascribes to the praefect *decorum genus*; and it may be inferred from Horace, that the pedigree had even been traced to the Homeric *Lamos*, the mythical king of the Laestrygons. But Tacitus and Horace are not plain folk, and do not always say what they mean. The notoriety thus given to this tradition probably counted for something in causing the selection of the family cognomen by Juvenal as a type of antique nobility¹. It is none the less possible, as may be seen by a glance at the amusing discussion of the *Vitellii* in the beginning of Suetonius' essay on the emperor so named, that this or that 'Aelius' had no more to do with *Lamos* or with the antiquities of the *Lamiae*, whatever they really were, than Thackeray's *Muggins* with *Hogyn Mogyn*, and that the nobility of the house, or of some who claimed its dignity, may have dated, and at no great distance, from the ambition and success of a Greek freedman. The Augustan 'peerage' was no more authentic than those of modern times. At all events, the name was Roman and respectable when Horace wrote, and we must therefore add to the former alternatives the chance that he uses it as Roman, either to designate a real person who bore it, or by arbitrary choice. And it is important to remember that each occurrence of the name is severally open to all these interpretations, as the identity of name is no proof of personal identity²; from the several contexts only can we judge, whether the same person is intended throughout, and what character or characters are to be supposed. External evidence as to the relations of Horace with any Lamia there is, I believe, none at all.

This said, let us consider simply upon the internal evidence the familiar seventeenth poem of the Third Book.

¹ Juv. iv. 154, vi. 385.

just cited, and compare ii. 4 with iv.

² See the *Appendix* of Mr Wickham 11, ii. 5 with iii. 15 etc.

Aeli vetusto nobilis ab Lamo—
 quando et priores hinc Lamias ferunt
 denominatos, et nepotum
 per memores genus omne fastos
 auctore ab illo ducit originem¹,
 qui Formiarum moenia dicitur
 princeps et innantem Maricae
 litoribus tenuisse Lirim,
 late tyrannus—cras foliis nemus
 multis et alga litus inutili
 demissa tempestas ab Euro
 sternet, aquae nisi fallit augur
 annosa cornix. dum potis, aridum
 compone lignum: cras Genium mero
 curabis et porco bimestri
 cum famulis operum solutis.

It has been already remarked, that in assigning a character to the *Lamiae* whom we meet in Horace, one only of the possible suppositions seems to have been considered. It has been assumed, for instance, here, that in *Lamia* we are to see a member of the family which produced the *praefectus* of the year A. D. 32, perhaps the *praefectus* himself. What aid has this assumption given to a satisfactory understanding of the poem before us? So little, that some have thought it necessary, if the poem is to be held genuine, to restore it to a form worthy of Horace by some excision, which method itself has proved so difficult of application, that a bolder and "more consistent" critic has pronounced the whole spurious. "The purpose of the poem can only be guessed." Rather, upon the current assumption, it cannot be guessed, as appears from the fact that scarcely any two commentators agree in their opinion. Nearly half the poem is occupied with a parenthesis on the mythical origin of the *Lamiae*, and the importance of this parenthesis, already great

¹ On the punctuation and reading here see the commentaries. The correction *ducit* (MSS. *ducis*), which is fortified by the strongest possible consensus of authority, is defended as a corollary from the required punctuation. But it is perhaps possible that *memores genus omne fastos* means "a

recording calendar of all kinds" or "classes." For the adjectival use of *hoc genus, id genus etc.* see the Diet. s.v. *genus*. Such a phrase would very well suit the purpose, as I conceive it, of the poet, and with this construction the punctuation does not require an alteration of the text.

from its proportion to the whole, tells more from the triviality of the remainder. The digression then (so infer some and not unreasonably) contains the point, the rest "merely supplying an imaginary reason for addressing Lamia at all". The object is to compliment the noble friend upon his long descent. But this object is so ill pursued, that more than half the modern readers of the poet seem to be in doubt whether the genealogical statement is to be taken seriously. "The introductory passage seems very much as if it were playful." "*Simulata autem, ni fallor, hujus digressionis gravitas admodum festive opponitur reliqui carminis hilaritati*". And it would certainly be difficult to ridicule a piece of false history more keenly than by the contrast between this pompous invocation, with its allegations in proof, and the bathos of the sequel—"it will be wet tomorrow; stack dry wood while you can; tomorrow you shall make yourself comfortable on pork and wine with the servants".

On the other hand, let us follow Orelli and accept the "*simulata gravitas*", and let us suppose, as then we must, that the Lamia addressed is a sensible man, who knows the true value of his own pedigree and would enter into the joke about his legendary forefather. How then is he rewarded for his sympathy with the poet's humour? By a couple of verses so empty and purposeless as to be in themselves an additional impertinence. The poem contains nothing but the jest, not even a proof or intimation of the poet's friendship.

We are assured indeed very positively by some that in the picture of the next day's feast we are to see a delicate invitation given by Horace to himself, to join the noble master and the reposing servants over their wine and their sucking-pig. But the suggestion only proves how strongly those who make it have felt the inanity of what is actually said, and the need of something, which is not said, to explain the poet's drift. The '*Selbsteinladung*' is simply not there. The honour of an '*Ode*' may have been great, may have proved much greater than the most far-seeing critic could have anticipated; but '*Lamia*' must indeed have been a man superior to vulgar prejudices and covetous to a fault of literary notice, if he was likely to be

grateful for such notice as this. Perhaps there is not a commentator who does not either say or show that he has wondered why the poem was ever written. Some, who express admiration of it, remark in the same breath that it might be better if it were otherwise than it is. Maclean himself (to whom few things are difficult) twits the critics, and the poet too, rather more gaily than usual,—which is perhaps only another way of making the general admission. Nor has it gone well with emendation. To diminish the ‘*simulata gravitas*’ (and to smooth the construction) it has been proposed to strike out lines 2—5, leaving only

Aeli, vetusto nobilis ab Lamo,
qui Formiarum etc.

But, except that what is not good is the better for being shorter, it is difficult, as many have replied, to see how we gain by this somewhat arbitrary proceeding—arbitrary, because there is no apparent motive for the supposed interpolation. The commencement remains grandiose, the sequel remains inept; and indeed a piece of verse, which is objectionable chiefly because there is too little in it, cannot be rectified by excision.

Under these circumstances, it is permissible to suggest that the method of interpretation which leads to so much disagreement, has not improbably taken a false start, and that the right road is already left, when it is assumed that the person intended is really one of the noble *Aelii* who distinguished themselves from other *Aelii* by the cognomen *Lamia*. The pedigree has seemed to many like a jest;—only, addressed to a real *Aelius*, and unsweetened by any graceful addition, such a jest is too like an insult. But is it addressed to a real *Aelius*? If we had the conclusion of the poem by itself, as a fragment, and were restoring the whole conjecturally, we should scarcely prefix an address to a friend of the poet, and that friend a nobleman. An order to lay in wood to-day, and a promise of wine and pork with the servants for tomorrow, would make us look a little lower than the curule seats. The language is surely that of a superior to an inferior, of a master to a servant, neither more nor less. Nor is this inconsistent with the invocation actually prefixed; on

the contrary it is upon this supposition only, as I think, that the invocation, with the whole poem, acquires a point and a purpose. That the name of a country gentleman's servant might well be *Lamia*, I hope to show very sufficiently in a moment. Of course no such person would bear the name of *Aelius*, or any gentile name at all; but neither did the person here addressed. The appellation *Aelius* is part of the jest. The slave's name is *Lamia*, and *Lamia* only. The accident that a family pretending to a prodigious antiquity bore the same as a cognomen suggests to the speaker, the master, the pretended inference, that his *Lamia* too must doubtless be an *Aelius* and, doubtless, a descendant of the Laestrygonian prince; and he gives him his title accordingly. As a jest between master and servant it is a fair bit of humour and, as proof of kindly feeling and easy intercourse, not unworthy of a little vignette to itself. If the use made of the family legend is not profoundly respectful, nothing could be more like Horace than to give such vanity a quiet pinch; rudeness of course there is none, when it is once understood that no veritable *Aelius* is in the view of the poem.

If this were the limit of our evidence, if we could carry matters no further than to say that the speaker here is a master, the person addressed a slave named *Lamia*, this interpretation would have claims to preference. The difficulties so often signalized disappear. The disproportionate length and dubious tone of the address, the triviality of the sequel, become at once intelligible, become in fact the point and substance of the piece. The poem presents a little scene from household life in the country, containing exactly the touches required and nothing besides. But the evidence does not end here, for we know a country servant named *Lamia*, and this *Lamia* was no other than the *vilicus* or steward at the poet's own farm. The reader will perhaps be surprised, but I will submit the evidence. To the steward on the poet's farm is addressed the fourteenth Epistle of the First Book—

Vilice silvarum et mihi me reddentis agelli etc.

The Epistle consists, it will be remembered, of an argument in favour of the country against the town, for which the steward,

formerly a town-slave, is supposed to have a mistaken preference. This 'thorn in the mind', this morbid dissatisfaction with the present, his master professes to extirpate by philosophy, and will prove himself, if possible, a more skilful 'weeder' in the moral field than the steward in the material. There is a circumstance which makes the discussion somewhat *mal à propos*, but Horace is disposed to push it nevertheless.

certemus spinas animone ego fortius an tu
evellas agro et melior sit Horatius an res—
me quamvis Lamiae pietas et cura moratur
fratrem maerentis, rapto de fratre dolentis
insolabiliter, tamen istuc mens animusque
fert et amat spatiis obstantia rumpere claustra—
rure ego viventem, tu dicis in urbe beatum; etc.

Who is this *Lamia*, the thought of whose grief for the loss of a brother makes the poet pause for a moment before urging upon his steward the commonplaces of his moral discourse? Surely it can be no other person than the steward himself. What other person's grief could have any bearing on the situation, or could occur to the mind of Horace in connexion with it? Here again the unfortunate intrusion of the 'consul and præfectus' seems to have sent explanation astray. Let us consider the matter fairly. Let it be supposed that this rising Aelius Lamia, or some member of his family known to Horace, had lost a lamented brother, and that the poet desired to record his sympathy. What a form of condolence is this! He represents himself writing a little lecture to his own servant, in the tone of a kindly patron, upon a matter of private difference between them, and into a parenthesis he puts the suffering of his noble friend, observing that it might but shall not prevent his intended communication. Why should it? Or what gratitude was the surviving Aelius likely to feel for the publication of the fact, that the recollection of his mourning made Horace half indisposed for a moment to chatter philosophy to his steward—though on second thoughts he determined to do so forthwith all the same? Horace is so much affected by Aelius' fraternal sorrow, that—he does *not* postpone a letter to his slave, which has no connexion with the subject, and for which any

other time would have done as well. There is, I submit, notwithstanding the tradition which has so long protected this view, but one way of giving the passage a connected sense, and that is, to take *Lamiae pietas* as an equivalent for *pietas tua*. The rhetorical figure, the change of person, is common enough, particularly in epistolary forms; the way is prepared for it here by the similar use of *Horatius* for *ego* in the previous line¹; and, what is more important, there is good reason for it in the ethical situation. In the substitution of the *Lamiae* for the *tua* there is something like respect; the third person is and always has been a less familiar form of address than the second. The humane feeling, which prompts the writer, even in the act of scolding good-humouredly a discontented slave, to avoid the appearance of forgetting a deep sorrow, not new but not exhausted,—this same humanity finds expression in the slightly ceremonious form of speech. It is a true touch. Grief and affection are in themselves respectable.

I said that this was the only way of giving connexion to the passage. Strictly speaking, it would meet the bare demands of the context if we supposed *Lamia* to be some person connected, though not identical, with the *vilicus* and likely therefore to be associated with him in thought—some other slave, for instance, in the household of Horace. But though this might do well enough in a real letter, where the correspondent has the key to the meaning, in a literary ‘epistle’ it is not intelligible without a note giving the facts. If, on the other hand, the steward and *Lamia* are one and the same, the passage is, as it should be, self-explanatory.

In either case this epistle shows us a *Lamia* who belongs to the household of Horace, and thus proves the personages of the ode to be real. The *Lamia* addressed is the slave of the epistle, the master is the poet himself. Between the master who jests and the master who condoles it is not difficult to find the re-

¹ So in Shakespeare *Mids. N. D.* II. 2. 54 Hermia to Lysander.

Now much beshrew *my* manners and my pride
If *Hermia* meant to say Lysander lied.

But there is scarcely need of illustration: every literature and even the language of common life supplies examples. Cf. *Od.* III. 9. 6, IV. 10. 5.

semblance, nor to see the suitability of both characters to the humane temper which in all relations Horace professes and probably maintained¹.

But because two of the references to the name *Lamia* designate no Aelius at all, but only a humble and melancholy namesake of the Aelii, it does not follow that every *Lamia* is to be so identified. Pope names his footman John, but not every John whom Pope knew was his footman. As before, the context must decide; and let us consider next the *Lamia* of Od. I. 36.

Et ture et fidibus iuvat
placare et vituli sanguine debito
custodes Numidae deos,
qui nunc Hesperia sospes ab ultima
caris multa sodalibus,
nulli plura tamen dividit oscula
quam dulci Lamiae, memor
actae non alio rege puertiae
mutataeque simul togae.

Apparently² the character here supposed is that of an *ingenuus*, nor is there at first sight any reason why this *Lamia* should not be an actual friend of the poet, an Aelius of the distinguished family. He might of course have an old school-fellow called Numida, whose return from the West (from the Cantabrian war, it is suggested) might be the subject of these rejoicings. This might be actual history; but there is one circumstance

¹ The chronological bearing of these passages is worth a moment's notice. Without the epistle the ode loses some of its point, as, except from the epistle, very few could know the name of a servant in the poet's house. We should naturally suppose, therefore, that when the Three Books were finally put in shape, the epistle, if not 'out', was at all events written and intended to appear immediately. Now I think it will be generally admitted that this is, to say the least, not likely to have been the case in the year 23. Another reason for the po-

sition taken in Essays II. and III.

² 'Apparently', for I do not think it honest to suppress my belief that this *Lamia* simply is what *her* name implies, a *meretrix*, the mistress of *Numida* when a lad. For the point of the masculine designation and attire in vv. 8, 9 see a Dictionary or Dictionary of Antiquities s. v. *toga*. The character is quite in keeping with the whole scene (see vv. 17—20), and the equivocal description of course designed. Had it not been designed, the name *Lamia* would have made it ridiculous.

against it. The names in the poem, or at least three of them, are *significant*. *Numida*, a form rudely Latinized from the Greek Νομάς, Νομάδος, signifies *The Wanderer*. Considering that Horace is fond of significant names¹, it is scarcely supposable that when he celebrates the return of a *Numida* from distant lands, the meaning of *Numida* was forgotten. This indeed is no proof that 'Numida' was not a real person, for Horace plays upon the consular name of *Bibulus* (III. 28. 8) as well as on the probably fictitious Γλυκερά. But then again in the subsequent lines,

neu multi Damalis meri
Bassum Threicia vincat amystide,

accident (or choice?) has again furnished a name suitable to the context. What is the true origin of *Bassus* as a Latin name, from what dialect even it came, may be doubted. When the *Odes* were in writing and for long after it was a very famous name and conveyed to every ear the thought of the greatest *parvenu* in republican history, the slave who had lately (B.C. 38) achieved the honours of a triumph (the *bâton de maréchal* in modern language) to the disgust of the *pur-sang* appropriators of the national honour who had no triumphs to show². It became proverbial, as Pliny tells us, for a *parvenu*, and in its Latin aspect may throw some light on the ideas of Horace about the ancestry of *Lamia*. But the language in which Horace is thinking here is Greek³, and from a Greek point of view *Bassus* (cf. βάσσων, βαθύς, βαθειᾶν κυλίκων τέρψις, βαθὺς κρητήρ etc.) is no ill name for the deeper drinker who is not to be beaten at the 'Thracian draught'. *Damalis* (*The Wench*, by original meaning *Heifer*) upon any theory would seem a mere Greek fiction; it is one of the numerous names derived from animals which Horace bestows by choice upon his female personages, *Lyce*, *Lycoris*, *Pholoe* (cf. φολίς) etc. With all this, as we have no independent

¹ See Mr Wickham's *Appendix* 1.

² See Smith's *Dict. Biog.* P. Ventilius Bassus.

³ In addition to the half Greek vocabulary, note the imitation of the Greek ἡ πολέουος by the peculiar

genitive (of quality) *multi meri*; that this is the construction the position of the words decides. Cf. III. 9. 7, IV. 1. 15 etc. Martial also plays upon *Bassus*, XI. 98.

evidence for any Numida or Bassus connected with the poet, and there is not a touch in the poem which suggests reality—the very region of *Numida's* travels is 'ultima Hesperia', that is, anywhere or nowhere—it would seem a safe supposition that the whole picture is fictitious, Numida, Bassus, Damalis and Lamia all puppets dubbed with names for convenience. As for the name *Lamia*, we know that it lay near to the poet's hand. It may be asked perhaps what it matters whether these persons were real or not, the meaning and colour of the poem remaining the same. The point is, however, not absolutely without interest, as may be shown more conveniently hereafter¹.

The fourth and only other use of the name occurs in what is apparently the most careless and trivial piece in the collection². As it is but three stanzas, I subjoin it entire :

Musis amicus tristitiam et metus
tradam protervis in mare Creticum
portare ventis, quis sub Arcto
rex gelidæ metuatur orae,
quid Tiridaten terreat, unice
securus. O quæ fontibus integris
gaudes, apricos necte flores,
necte meo Lamiae coronam,
Pimplea dulcis ! nil sine te mei
prosunt honores : hunc fidibus novis,
hunc Lesbio sacrare plectro
teque tuasque decet sorores.

From the accident that the political events alluded to were uncertain in date, the poem has been the subject of a discussion which does not here concern us³. Written earlier or written later, it is not without its small difficulty as to "the point of connection between the first and last parts" of it, the question why *Lamia* should be so emphatically pronounced a proper theme for the Muse and her friend in their singular indifference to political anxieties. Without professing a positive answer, I think that here again the consul and præfectus with his possible relations have been of little service. It is not enough to say that he or some Aelius Lamia known to Horace

¹ See the essay, *Venus and Myrtale*.

² 1. 26.

³ See Orelli's notes, Wickham, Intro. to Od. 1—111. §8, and *sup.* Essay 111.

may have been a somewhat melancholy youth who would benefit by the contagious example of gaiety. This fact is neither likely to have been generally notorious nor given by the poem, which indeed determines scarcely anything, except perhaps that Horace in his true and proper person is the speaker. Believing the key to the poem to be at present lost and very likely not recoverable, I would only note that there may be a certain significance in the phrases *fidibus novis...Lesbio plectro*. If these words are not idle, and neither the style of Horace nor the brevity of these verses would make us suppose so, it is *the example of Alcaeus* and the Greek Ἐρωτικοὶ which suggests the recommendation of *Lamia* to the Muse. Long ago the internal evidence of the metre led a great critic to the conclusion, that this piece was probably among the earlier attempts of the poet in imitation of the Alcaic stanza¹; and it may be conjectured that our difficulties might disappear, if we knew, as the Roman reader probably knew, the precise original which Horace has in view. Was it one of those poems, which Horace elsewhere describes as typical of the Lesbian soldier and singer, poems in which Alcaeus charmed away the distresses of his adventurous life with singing the praises of the beautiful young page, who seems to have played Patroclus to this lyric Achilles?—

qui ferox bello tamen inter arma,
sive iactatam religarat udo
litore navim,
Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi
semper haerentem puerum canebat
et Lycum nigris oculis nigroque
crine decorum².

Certainly such a poem would not admit of serious translation from the conditions of Alcaeus to those of Horace. It would scarcely have suited the humour of the retired clerk of the treasury at his quiet farm to pose in the old-fashioned armour of such a fighting troubadour as the exile of Lesbos. But the very contrast of characters might give piquancy to an

¹ See Lachmann's argument, cited by Orelli and Wickham. The word *novis* itself assists the inference.
² I. 32. 6.

imitation which was something of a parody; and if the *Lamia* for whom Horace twines the lyric wreath must be a real person, I see no reason why he may not be the only real *Lamia*—as I have tried to show—to whom Horace introduces us, his slave and (the *Epistle* justifies the word) his friend, the *Lamia* in his own household. Doubtless this not very gay personage is an odd representative of ‘beauteous Lycus, black of hair and eye’, but Horace, when he wrote the *Odes*, was at least as odd a representative of *Alcaeus*¹; the *Sancho* and the *Quixote* seem not ill matched, and the parallel very much in the spirit of the jesting touch, borrowed from the life of the Greek master, with which the Roman *Alcaeus* adorns the recollection of his own military career—

tecum Philippos et celerem fugam
sensi relictæ non bene parmula.

Moreover, thanks to the fidelity with which *Demetrius Poliorcetes* continued to fling the spoil of cities into the lap of his ‘Vampire’ long after her wrinkles were visible to every eye but his, the name of *Lamia* was of as high fame in the literature of ‘erotica’ as *Lais* or *Phryne* itself, and the coincidence with that of the slave adds a fresh touch of humorous incongruity.

There is thus a point in the insistent emphasis of *hunc fidibus novis, hunc Lesbio plectro*, and a meaning in the assurance that to celebrate *Lamia* is a ‘becoming’ task. ‘If you take me for your *Alcaeus*’, the poet would say to the erotic Muse, ‘my attendant—whose name at least is known to you—must do for your Lycus, and then together we will forget politics as the old Greek forgot war.’ This he may have meant; whether he actually did, it would be rash to pronounce till a roll of *Alcaeus* shall be found in some library of the Levant.

¹ On the part which Horace assigns himself in the Three Books, see the essay *Venus and Myrtale*.

QVAM TIBERIS LAVIT.

THOSE—they are probably now a majority even among reading people—who have not read the once familiar piece of verse in which Addison celebrated the victory of Blenheim, will nevertheless perhaps remember the criticism of it in Macaulay's essay, and, in particular, his acute remark upon the passage in which the guiding genius of Marlborough is compared to the angel who 'directs the storm'. Macaulay points out that the great impression produced by this simile upon the generation to whom it was first addressed may be attributed not more to its really skilful rhetoric than to an allusion introduced very unskilfully in a prosaic parenthesis. The storm which the angel directs is

Such as, of late, o'er pale Britannia passed.

To us, unless we have read ourselves, as Macaulay had, into the mental attitude of 1704, this means nothing; in 1704 it meant everything. It called up instantly the most awful picture of violence that the reader knew or could conceive, and *for the time* served the purpose of Addison better than if he could have commanded the sound and fury of Milton's Hell. It is an illustration, adds the critic truly but with only partial truth, of the advantage which, in rhetoric and poetry, the particular has over the general. An advantage very dearly bought, when "the particular" is handled after the manner of Addison. It is true that no small excision here or addition there would make *The Campaign* fit to live through ages in the living interest of men. The best work in it, the storm itself, is not of that quality; but, such as it is, it is half-killed for us by the very parenthesis which was once so vital. Even

the verse of *Paradise Lost* would be numbed by thrusting into it

(Such as, of late, o'er pale Britannia passed).

Clearly, for a writer who looks to posterity, allusion, effective as it is for the moment, is a very dangerous aid. Only the most clear and catholic judgment, only that intuition which, whatever else is held or dropped, grasps firmly what is permanent and for all time, the intuition which belongs to a great literary epoch and together with the patient perfection of form produces the quality which we call 'classical', will enable a writer to be allusive, and secure the gain of the moment, and yet sacrifice nothing to allusion, and so not incur the loss of the future. Such an intuition and such patience the Augustan writers had. They teem with allusion; it is scarcely possible to read a page or dig up a stone relating to the Augustan epoch without striking on an illustration, on something which throws light beyond itself. In the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, the *Aeneid*, the *Satires*, *Epodes*, *Odes*, *Epistles*, in all the writings of Ovid and Propertius, the reign of Augustus, its wars, politics, even its scandal, is never out of mind. The epic itself is a vast parable of the *New Ilion*, that rebuilding of the Roman polity under the auspices of *Iulus*, which was the idea and practical guide of the living generation. As for Horace, the thing most certain about his work is that we shall never *fully* understand it, as it was understood by contemporaries. 'In what shape comest thou' cries the prophet-poet, 'O long-expected saviour of Rome? Art thou now on earth, in human form disguising the son of gentle Maia, and submitting to the name of Cæsar's avenger?' Not till quite recently was it suspected that in giving to Octavian the character of *Mercurius*, Horace was not only making a plausible comparison, but reflecting an actual cult, one of the many in which the political aspirations of the time were breathed into the forms of a moribund religion. And yet, although the records of Augustus have long ago suffered such ruin as Horace could scarcely have conceived, the *Odes* are still living literature after such a lapse of time as the boldest claimant of 'immortality' might be afraid to foresee, ✓

and have been read with interest through periods, when men not only knew little of the Augustan age, but were by prejudice and temper incapable of understanding it.

The causes, or some of them, are plain. The great Latin writers live for the remote barbarian partly because they did not disdain to remember him while they wrote¹, and to consider that a literature which would be œcumenical must have those merits which can be always and everywhere appreciated—a simple human interest independent of local circumstance and, along with this, the utmost grace and finish of form. It is the misfortune of our own literature, whose splendour is great enough to confess defects, that the brief flower-time of the language was not better used, and that the best English which has been or probably can be written, (that of the late Stuart and early Georgian period) is in great part, on such topics and in such a manner, that already it scarcely commands the hearty interest even of Englishmen, and beyond the English speaking peoples has ceased to live at all. The fact that the greatest composer of the day, when challenged to do his best, contents himself with

(Such as, of late, o'er pale Britannia passed)

goes far to explain the different fate of the Latin and the English literatures belonging to the periods which we call 'Augustan'.

It is very seldom that Horace has sinned in this way and written something which we feel to have lost its *whole* effect and become positively bad by change of circumstances and our ignorance of what was familiar to the first readers. Such is the strange parenthesis in IV. 4—

videre Raetis bella sub Alpibus
Drusum gerentem Vindelici;—quibus
mos unde deductus per omne
tempus Amazonia securi
dextras obarmet quaerere distuli
nec scire fas est omnia—sed diu etc.

¹ Of the author of the *Odes* this is fanciful has a real meaning. literally true. See II. 20, which though

at which we can only look with amazement, though that scarcely justifies us in striking it out: such is the ill-planned and, we may almost say, ill-written *Te maris et terrae* (I. 28)¹. But on the whole, considering the perpetual reference in the *Odes* to contemporary events and persons, it is wonderful, and a great testimony to the tact of the author, how much beauty and interest remains in them, even when stripped of all local and temporal advantages. Let us ask what would be left of the *Religio Laici* or *Absalom and Achitophel* or the *Spectator* or the *Dunciad*, or in fact most English literature (save Milton's work) between the Restoration and the last Stuart rebellion, if we knew no more of Petre and Burnet, Shaftesbury and Monmouth, Hampton Court and Will's coffee-house, the Fleet and Twickenham, than we now know of Pollio, Plancus, the Esquiline and the Subura.

Nevertheless, though Horace and his contemporaries have taken care so to write that they might survive their allusions, they have lost very much; and no pains can be too great to secure all the illustration we have left and to recover what may yet be found. '*Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?*' Only a small hint, and that not beyond question. Still it is perhaps worth the reader's consideration.

The poem addressed '*moriture Delli*' (II. 3) is one of those seeming commonplaces whose triteness Horace forces us to forget by sheer beauty of style. It is the old moral,

aequam memento rebus in arduis
servare mentem, non secus in bonis,

enforced by the old arguments from the brevity and uncertainty of life. Where and how *Dellius*² lived, how and when he died, we do not know. The bare outline of his shifting political career, which is nearly all the biography we have left, has but a remote connexion with Horace's picture. This being so, it is impossible for us to say how much special

¹ III. 20 is perhaps another example; at least I must confess myself unable to see now any sufficient reason for its existence.

² If indeed it be *Dellius* and not *Gellius* (another person altogether), for the reading varies.

colour there is in it, what touches of person or place, once vivid but now faded away. But unless I am mistaken, there is a point still ascertainable in the descriptive words which stand at the head of this essay—though we might easily glide over them now with as little interest as over Addison's parenthesis.

quo pinus ingens albaque populus
 umbram hospitem consociare amant
 ramis (quid obliquo laborat
 lympa fugax trepidare rivo?),
 huc vina et unguenta et nimium breves
 flores amoenae ferre iube rosae,
 dum res et aetas et sororum
 fila trium patiuntur atra.¹
 cedes coemtis saltibus et domo
 villaque, *flavus quam Tiberis lavit*,
 cedes et exstructis in altum
 divitiis potietur haeres.
 divesne prisco natus ab Inacho
 nil interest an pauper et infima
 de gente sub divo moreris,
 victima nil miserantis Orci.

Apart from any special meaning which may lie in the allusion to the Tiber, it is plain that here, as elsewhere, the speaker draws a parable from nature. The grass and the inviting shade of the trees themselves read a lesson of repose, which the flying stream and the brief rose complete by the addition of a warning. If the poet thinks it worth while to note that the country-seat of Dellius is 'washed by the yellow

¹ I have printed the first eight lines of this citation according to what seems to me the right punctuation of the reading given by the best MSS. *quo* answers to *huc*, and *quid...rivo?* is a parenthesis, meaning 'Why, the place where we stand being so charming as it is, why does the flying stream (too apt a type of fretful man) still struggle to haste along its sloped course, instead of pausing to enjoy?' The punctuation *...ramis?...rivo?* with the explanation 'To what purpose do the

trees give shade, or why does the stream flow—(if not that we may enjoy them)?' does not accord with the special manner in which the stream is described. The speaker draws a warning from the stream which, if it knew whither it went, would not be so hasty to be gone, just as he draws an example from the rose immediately afterwards, and from the wind and rain in II. 9, from the flowers and moon in II. 11. 8, etc. Parentheses are a "marked feature of most Latin styles" (Munro).

Tiber', this fact is probably not without some bearing on the 'sermon from stones' which he reads him. It need not indeed be assumed that the full force of what is said would be perceptible either to speaker or hearer at the time. On the contrary, the effect would be all the better if there were something of that significance larger than the words which the Greeks so highly valued under the name of 'irony'. And although the glance towards the Tiber does add something to the general pleasantness of the scene, it is not much; and I think the reader will feel, on reading the poem, that if there is anything in its fine balances of clause and phrase which does not fall quite as it should, or might at all events have been spared, it is in the words *flavus quam Tiberis lavit*. Yet it might well be argued that they are the important words in the piece; for the note which they convey to one fresh from readings in the Augustan period is *the note of danger*.

*quod adest memento
componere aecus; cetera fluminis
ritu feruntur, nunc medio aequore
cum pace delabentis Etruscum
in mare, nunc lapides adesos
stirpesque raptas et pecus et domos
volventis una, non sine montium
clamore vicinaeque silvae,
cum fera diluvies quietos
irritat amnes. ille potens sui
laetusque deget, cui licet in diem
dixisse 'Vixi'.*¹

Such is the moral which Horace, in the conclusion of the *Odes*, draws from a plague only too well known to his readers, the plague of floods. It is a danger from which Italy has always suffered, and which towards the close of the civil wars and in the reign of Augustus recurred with appalling frequency, owing to the ruinous condition into which works of all kinds both in town and country were reduced by two generations of violence, pillage and impoverishment. What an impression this scourge had produced on the popular mind, and upon Horace himself, may be judged from the place which he has given it

¹ III. 29. 32.

in the opening and, as just seen, in the close of his work¹. The description and the moral from it which, in III. 29, he has drawn out at length, in II. 3 he has called up, sufficiently for ears rendered sensitive through experience, by a single careless touch—*flavus quam Tiberis lavit*. For the golden water is beautiful enough in this summer weather; the pine and the poplar, as they embrace over the streamlet which hurries to mix with it, seem a very picture of friendliness and peace. But why is the river golden? Because the banks are of weak sand, and the river is silently ‘washing’ them away. Imagine the same place under other circumstances,

cum fera diluvies quietos
irritat amnes.

How would the *lymphæ fugax*, which now frets harmlessly in its zig-zag, swell to a torrent before which the opposing earth would melt away! How would the ‘huge’ pine and the poplar ‘white’ in the wind come crashing down and be swept with the other ‘*stirpes raptæ*’ into the whirling flood! Where on such a day might be the farm-stead, *flavus quam Tiberis lavit*, where the ‘*domus*’ (the picture in III. 29 would make us ask) or even the master himself? Safe in his luxury, or flying for his life with the beggar whose house is ‘the open sky’? These are the thoughts which the picture of a farm-stead ‘washed by the yellow Tiber’ was likely to suggest to a reader of the year 19 B. C.; with these words the poem is no commonplace at all, but a living parable, and that is why they are worth their place².

These are not the only places where Horace has found a ‘book in the running brook’, and appealed skilfully to the memories of peril which were associated with the rivers of Italy

¹ II. 2. 1, III. 29. *l.c.*

² Whether there was any particular reason for connecting these thoughts with the name or death of Dellius it is useless to ask. It is to be noted, however, that this poem by no means proves he was not dead when it was written, any more than II. 10, II. 18,

III. 19 prove the like of Murena. On the contrary the character of the poem, taken with the general method of the *Odes*, makes it extremely probable that he was. There is a similar omen, at the second reading, in the description of the river in the opening chapter of the ‘*Mill on the Floss*’.

from the special circumstances of the time. In these it is the Tiber which furnishes the text ; in I. 31 it is the Liris. 'What asks the bard of his patron Apollo? Not Sardinia's corn, nor Calabria's herds, not gold nor ivory of India,

non rura quae Liris quieta
mordet aqua, taciturnus amnis.
premant Calena falce, quibus dedit
Fortuna, vitem, etc.

Here again the same note of transitoriness is set upon the gifts of Fortune, by the same suggestive picture of the silent stream, which frets the soil unheeded and lays the preparation for that devastating sweep which some day carries everything away. That Horace, when he put the *Odes* together, had reason to remember the Liris in connexion with a great storm and flood is certain from III. 17. The scene of that poem, as shewn in the preceding essay, is Horace's own Sabine 'agellus', the persons being himself and the steward who lived there, and the topic a forecast of high wind and violent rain on the morrow. By a jest upon the servant's name he has so turned the address that the name of *Formiae* is as it were casually introduced ; and it is clear that this chance of the tongue, like most 'chances' in the *Odes*, is not so very casual. For not only is the thought of *Formiae* and its open shore linked with the picture of the coming storm (v. 10) ; but the description of the site is carefully drawn so as to suggest the consequences likely to ensue when the river, which 'floats over' (*innantem*) the marshy coastline, receives a sudden increase of water, accompanied by a strong wind down stream (*ab Euro*) and met at the mouth by a high-running sea. "Probably the stormy weather, if not actually allegorical, is used to enforce a moral beyond that which appears on the surface." So most justly divines Mr Wickham, referring to I. 3, I. 4, I. 5, I. 7, I. 11, I. 38, II. 3, II. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and in short to half the poems in the collection. The fact is that this parable from nature, this manner of suiting the changes of external scene to those of the internal thought, is characteristic of the *Odes*, scarcely less than of *In Memoriam*,

which, in spite of all the differences, has more resemblance to the plan of Horace than any other work which I know¹. The comparison most to the point is that of I. 11, where the circumstances of the time direct the speaker for an illustration of the current text to the place where Agrippa's new moles 'are breaking the strength of the Tuscan sea.' That 'the morrow' of that day when Horace bade Lamia lay in wood was a well-remembered morrow, and that something then happened by 'Marica's shore', in the light of which his 'augury', with its playful jest, would seem grave enough, the form of the Three Books suggests, to my thinking, not ambiguously. What was it?

A positive answer cannot of course be given upon the present evidence. Hints however there are, fallacious perhaps, but worth combining, if only on the chance that some happy discovery may complete the links. The time may be fixed easily from Horace himself and from Dion. It is the autumn or late summer (*v.* 9) of the pestiferous year 23, long remembered among seasons of destruction, not only for the more than usually terrible ravages of lightning and floods, but because these signs of perturbation in Nature were taken for an omen, fulfilled in the death of Marcellus. "Such an event", says Dion, "is commonly preceded by portents; and on this occasion a wolf was captured in the city, many buildings were damaged by fire and storm, and the Tiber rose till it swept away the wooden bridge and laid the city under water for three days²." Now the *Odes* themselves show that the autumn in which III. 17 is laid must be either that of 24 or that of 23³. Indeed there is scarcely an alternative, for all indications point to the first day (Jan. 1, or March 1) of the year 22 (not 23) as the date of Murena's banquet, and the close sequence of seasons in III. 17, III. 18 (Dec. 5)⁴, and III. 19 would be pointless if the seasons were *not* sequent. (The reason for this special precision of dates is

¹ Ode iv. 7, where the whole year, with its passing seasons, is moralized in the same spirit, is in this as in other ways a sort of reflexion in miniature of Books I.—III.

² 53. 33.

³ The limits are given by III. 14 and III. 19.

⁴ Note that *aprica* in *v.* 2 does not imply that the season is warm any

obvious; the plot of the tragedy is thickening and the climax close at hand.) But even without this assistance, there is enough in III. 17 itself to carry the mind of a contemporary to the time intended. Horace, like Addison, is thinking "not of *a* storm, but of *the* storm", and so would his readers think. But of Marcellus and the foreboding Tiber he is plainly not thinking. When the capital was in the state described by Dion, it is easy to imagine what was the state of the Liris and the coast-lands about its mouth, and how it fared with whatever stood on the shores which the sea and the Liris' 'silent stream' had 'bitten' unperceived. Horace is not thinking of Marcellus. Of whom then is he thinking? The outbreak of the indignant Tiber upon Rome presaged the death of Marcellus. What death did the ravages upon Formiae and Marica presage? This is the train of reflexion upon which a Roman taking up the *Odes* in the year 19 would be put by this pregnant allusion to the ominous storm of 23.

more than in Prop. v. 10. 18 *qui tulit aprico frigida castra Lare*. In fact, according to the use of the word in the *Odes*, it implies the opposite: *unsheltered* or *exposed* would be the correct translation, as in Propertius. Like the *parvi alumni*, the *aprica rura* appeal to the protection of Faunus. The word is a sign of winter; and so it is, I think, both in I. 8. 3 and I. 26. 7. The description *patiens pulveris atque solis* must by the context describe the past, not the present, character of 'Sybaris'; and the point is that whereas in the summer no dust or sun could fatigue him, now, in the winter, he has turned luxurious, shuns the 'unsheltered Campus' and 'fears the touch of Tiber'. In summer a bath would itself be a luxury, and the reproach would lose its point. Further the dictionary will show that the warmth commonly signified by *apricus*, when it signifies warmth at all, is not intolerable heat but pleasant mildness, as *e. g.* in Hor.

Sat. I. 8. 15. The fundamental sense is not *warm* but *clear*. (I am assuming here that the accusative case *apricum* is correct; but see the end of Essay VII.) In *aprici flores* the epithet has precisely the same sense as in Persius' *aprici senes*; we have no exact translation in English (*chilly* or *delicate* come near) but the French *frileux* is exact. The sort of persons, animals, and plants so called are those to which warmth is grateful or necessary—old men, *mergi*, the *buxus*. The flowers with which Lamia is to be wreathed are *winter* flowers, grown in chosen places or by artificial forcing ('coddled' in short, if the expression were not too low), and therefore *frileux* or *warmth-seeking*. The slight sneer accords well with the other references of Horace to artificial horticulture (see I. 38, II. 15, *supra* p. 35). An allusion to *summer* flowers would spoil the colour of I. 26, and both this and I. 8 should by position be poems of winter.

Now the Roman reader knew, as we may know, whom and whose death the poet had in mind when he arranged III. 16 and III. 18 and III. 19¹; and would not therefore require much prompting to fit the omen of III. 17 with an interpretation. The only question is—was there, to our knowledge, a connexion between the region of the Liris and the family of Murena? Undoubtedly there was; for there, at Formiae, lay his house, the house which he lent to Maecenas, Capito, and the other ambassadors with whom Horace journeyed to Brundisium²; and with the house, we may presume, his own original property received from his predecessor the client of Cicero³. And it will be observed that this connexion also shows the force of the two other references to Formiae in the work. Twice does Horace contrast his own modest fortunes with *the wealth of Formiae*, in both places addressing Maecenas, and in both addressing him emphatically as *eques*, that is, below the dangerous elevation of the *patricia luna*; first in I. 20—

Vile potabis modicis Sabinum
cantharis,...care Maecenas *eques*,

mea nec Falernae
temperant vites neque *Formiani*
pocula colles⁴.—

and again (just before the reference to the storm and as if for the very purpose of leading up to it) in III. 16,

iure perhorru
late conspicuum tollere verticem.
Maecenas, *equitum decus*.....
quamquam nec Calabrae mella ferunt apes
nec *Laestrygonia*⁵ Bacchus in amphora
languescit mihi.

¹ See Essay II. pp. 56, 65, and *passim*.

² *Sat.* I. 5. 38.

³ How much of this property he actually retained after his 'spoliation', we cannot say, nor does it matter. I. 20 dates from before the 'spoliation'; and the words of III. 16 merely serve

to recall the association of ideas.

⁴ On this poem and the reading in v. 10 see Note C.

⁵ i.e. Formian; see the commentaries; and note that this *Laestrygonia* is echoed by the reference to *Lamos* in III. 17.

The contrast thus hinted, and the purpose of it, is the same as in II. 18. Here, there, and throughout, the poet's moral takes material shape in the same riches, the same rapacious pride, and the same fate.

What then was the ominous thing which happened at Formiae in that autumn of storm¹?

¹ There is one link between II. 17 and III. 18 the purpose of which is beyond imagination, though it is not at all likely to be without one. The nymph *Marica* became by Faunus the mother of King Latinus (Verg. *Aen.* 7. 47); and in mentioning her name Horace has not forgotten this legend,

as appears by the *Faune nympharum fugientum amator*, which follows immediately afterwards. When we can find a complete biography and pedigree of Murena, then and not before we shall be in a position to complete a commentary on the *Odes*.

NOTE (C) to ESSAY V. (See p. 144.)

Ode i. 20. Having had occasion to cite this poem, I am tempted to offer my suggestion as to the well-known difficulty in *v.* 10.

Vile potabis medicis Sabinum
cantharis, Graeca quod ego ipse testa
conditum levi, datus in theatro
cum tibi plausus,
care Maecenas eques, ut paterni
fluminis ripae simul et iocosa
redderet laudes tibi Vaticani
montis imago.
Caecubum et prelo domitam Caleno
tu bibes uvam: mea nec Falernae
temperant vites neque Formiani
pocula colles.

That something is wrong in the words *tu bibes* is generally agreed. "If it stands," writes Mr Wickham, "it must mean 'I must leave *you* to drink', that is, at home." But the "great awkwardness in the difference of sense which we are thus obliged to put on the future here and in *v.* 1, *potabis*" is a blemish incredible in a miniature poem of this kind, and a poem of Horace: nor is this blemish, in my opinion, the strongest objection. Considering that Horace is inviting Maecenas to the retreat which he enjoyed by Maecenas' liberality, is there not a singular want of taste in this emphatic contrast between the entertainment he could offer and such as the minister could enjoy at home? 'Come' says Horace, 'to the Sabine farm which you gave me; but remember' he adds in effect, 'that you have not provided for me as you do for yourself.'

It is a very different thing when in the other like invitation

(III. 29) he dwells on the *relief* which the statesman, tired of noise and pomp and care, would find in a more simple life—

plerumque gratae divitibus vices
mundaeque parvo sub lare pauperum
cenae sine aulacis et ostro
sollicitam explicuere frontem.

This is to say 'You have provided for me what is in truth more delightful than your necessary burden of splendour', and enhances the value of the gift, which is only depreciated by the contrast of the *Caecubum* with the *vile Sabinum*. For this reason, with others of less weight, I am not satisfied even with Mr Munro's *Tu vides* 'you provide'¹ (derived from the reading of one MS *Tu bides* through the common writing of *v* as *b*); though I am indebted to it for what I am going to propound. The MS in question is not of much authority in general, but it ought in this reading to have great weight, for the simple reason that it offers us nonsense. *Tu bides* means nothing; and the presumption is therefore strong that it is not an arbitrary invention, as *Tu bibes* well may be; nor is it at all likely to be an error for *Tu bibes*. The starting-point for us is *Tu bides* and the question is—What original reading produced this? I suggest that it was *Invidēs*, in the sense of *you look at askance, enviously, with an evil eye*, for which and the construction with the accusative see the Dictionary *s.v.*² The second stanza, by the allusion to Maecenas' recovery from a dangerous illness, recalls his weak health. His specific complaint is described as a tendency to fever and consequent loss of sleep; Pliny says of him that he lived as in a perpetual fever, and towards the close of his life scarcely slept at all. In Roman medicine prescription and prohibition of wine or of particular wines played a great part. Pliny, beside many single references, gives a copious review of the subject³, and among other

¹ *Journal of Philology*, Vol. III. p. 349.

² Horace has the corresponding passive *invideri* in *Ars Poet.* 56, *Od.* II. 10. 7, *Od.* III. 1. 45: Cicero cites the active from Accius (*Tusc.* 3. 9) and de-

fends it. Here the accusative is particularly appropriate; in the dative, if they were mentioned, would be the more fortunate persons who could take *Caecuban* safely and with pleasure.

³ *Ilist. Nat.* xxiii. 19, foll.

things describes the treatment of fevers—that wine must not be given in general, and in what cases and when it is required, for example in a sleeping draught¹. Now the Latian and Campanian growths mentioned by Horace were among the strongest and most spirituous in the Roman list, as he indicates by the picturesque epithet *domitam*; and moreover those to which he gives prominence were special *fever medicines*. The *Caecuban*, in particular, a growth small in quantity, was already in the time of Horace extremely precious, a wine to be kept with ‘a hundred keys’, and laid up for the highest occasions of festivity, or for medical use². A century later, according to Pliny, it was no longer grown at all³; but *Caecuban*, or something which passed under that name, was still in request, as well as *Falernian*, for patients with fever, to whom small doses of it were sent as a present by sympathising friends. In Martial a certain Tongilius, who has a taste for such doses, shams fever to get them—

uri Tongilius male dicitur hemitritaeo.
 novi hominis mores; esurit atque sitit;...
 Caecuba saccetur, quaeque annus coxit Opimi;
 condantur parco fusca Falerna vitro⁴.

There was therefore every reason why Maecenas should now ‘look askance at’ these much-prized delicacies, which he was probably forbidden to take in the ordinary way, and would receive with about as much appetite as a child feels for the particular jam in which he is accustomed to take powder. Others might enjoy them, but he could not; and this is precisely the attitude of mind which *invidet*. Nor with the best intentions was it easy at a Roman table to be sure that you took no *Falernian* or *Formian*; for a wine with a safe name might have been flavoured with another, a bad practice at which Horace perhaps glances with his ‘temperant (*mix*)’, a word also in medical use and so under the circumstances

¹ *ib.* 24.

² *Epod.* ix. 1, *ib.* 36 (note the word *metire* here), *Od.* i. 37. 5 (with direct allusion to *Epod.* ix. 1), *Od.* ii. 14. 25.

³ *Hist. Nat.* xxiii. 20, *Caecuba iam non gignuntur*.

⁴ *Mart.* ii. 40.

unpleasantly suggestive¹. On the other hand a pure *vin ordinaire* taken moderately, such as the 'cheap Sabine in not too large a jug', which Horace offers, is the most wholesome beverage or at least commonly so regarded. Moreover Horace is careful to note that he bottled and sealed it himself, so that there would be no danger of such abominations in the way of sealing as Pliny mentions with horror—'*saluberrimum, cui nihil in musto additum est; meliusque, si nec vasis pix affuit: marmore enim et gypso aut calce condita, quis non etiam validus expaverit?*' The 'Greek bottle' is probably used for flavour, but it at all events warrants immunity from the Latian poison and perhaps was supposed useful in itself.

Thus here, as in III. 29, Horace contrives to make the limit of his means an attraction in itself to one situated as Maecenas. 'I shall not offer you', he says, 'the Caecuban and the Falernian, which they mix with their drink in the great houses of Rome; and you will not therefore be spectator of enjoyments which you dare not partake.'

It is not really inconsistent with this that in Epode IX. Horace looks forward to drinking *Caecuban* in Maecenas' company. The occasion is so extraordinary that no common rules would apply to it.

¹ *misceri plura genera omnibus inutile* is Pliny's prescription, *ib.* 24.

VENUS AND MYRTALE.

THE time is long past when the love-poems of Horace were taken for so many personal revelations, and *Glycera*, *Barine*, or *Myrtale* were thought deserving of a place in historical biography. It is now recognized that Horace must be interpreted like other lyric poets, and not supposed to mean "Flaccus" wherever he writes an "ego". But errors—the comparison is becoming trite—are like the useless parts in a species which is developing under changed conditions; they disappear gradually, and leave a rudiment. It may be useful therefore to enquire exactly how much remains of the "Amores Horatiani" when the *Odes* are rationally read, and what really is the attitude of the poet towards the subject which he declares to be the chief theme of his kind. We will follow, here as elsewhere, the historical division, and speak first of the Three Books separately.

The truth is that in the Three Books Horace never writes of *himself* as actually in love, and hardly mentions his love affairs at all. Not much less than half the pieces bear on the relations of men to women; about a third contain evidence more or less clear that the poet speaks in his proper person; but these lists are mutually exclusive, except in two or three cases at most.

Some, which the influence of old mistakes might pass off for such, will not bear examination. Such are the two Sabine idylls, the invitation to Tyndaris (I. 17) and the praise of Lalage (I. 22), a pair very like each other and very unlike anything else in the work. They are poems of love in the same sense that the *bergeries* of porcelain are pictures of love, but the shepherd is no more Horace, or any other creature of the common clay;

than the country, where snakes do not bite nor men do violence and the simple singer cries "A miracle!" because a solitary wolf runs away, is the real *ager Sabinus*. The country is *Arcady*, as we are expressly told¹, and the shepherd is the eternal shepherd, a charming figure, virtuous, loving, blessed, but—as Horace hints in the 'Lalage' by borrowing for the friend whom the swain addresses the name of the sly and town-loving Fuscus—just a little *too* lovely for this earth². It is still the fashion, inherited from the "Amores Horatiani", to entitle i. 17 "An invitation from Horace to his mistress" or "An invitation to his Sabine farm", but the intrusion of this figure (if we took our inscriptions seriously) would make strange work. The real Marlowe could not be more out of place in '*Come live with me.*' A mistress! Why in *Arcady* the very goats are 'husband and wife'³! The shepherd's *Tyndaris* is to sing of 'Penelope and siren Circe striving about one man' of the contention, that is to say, between the wife and the false enchantress in which victory fell to the lawful possessor,—a pretty subject for a lady entertained by an obstinate bachelor. Lalage's lover talks the purest Arcadian, "Set me where the treeless plain" etc., "Set me where the car of day" and so forth. When the poet would paint realities, not to say himself, he has another style than this. Imagine Horace, the humorous and critical, sweetly ranting about poles and tropics! Well may Mr Munro think that if Horace must match love-poems against Catullus, it is not with *Integer vitæ* that he should cap *Acmen Septimius*⁴. The spirit of humour forbid! One is life, the other a play of beautiful puppets, with the real Horace turning the wheel and twinkling just perceptibly at the real Fuscus. But comparisons are—like the husband of the she-goats.

¹ i. 17. 1.

² See the references to Fuscus in Wickham on i. 22.

³ i. 17. 7.

⁴ *Elucidations of Catullus*, p. 236. Mr Munro, I should perhaps add, thinks that, though Horace has not outdone Catullus, he meant to do so,

and is severe upon him accordingly. I cannot believe that Horace was so deceived, or would have dreamed of a comparison between the poems, unless it were to heighten by contrast the playful effect of his own delicate rhodomontade.

In a different style but scarcely more autobiographical is the celebrated recantation (I. 16). The speaker is one who having lampooned a lady in his youth has lived to grow wiser, and to desire reconciliation with the injured fair. It is not necessary to suppose that the personages are lovers, or ever were; the stiff rhetoric is that of gallantry not affection. Horace had written lampoons, some of which he afterwards published; and in 35—34, which according to the arrangement of the *Odes* would be the supposed date of the recantation, he had touched *la trentaine* and was therefore old enough for the part; but that is all. From the style of the allusions it seems improbable that the speaker or the person addressed were to be recognized, and for references to any lampoon in particular the poem has been searched in vain. The only effect of it is to hint in a vague way that the author of the *Odes* has left the author of the *Epodes* behind him and desires that he may be thought of as little as possible.

But there is in these Books (I. 33) one allusion to love, or at least to woman, which professes to be from the author's own story; and it deserves a careful examination.

Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor
immitis Glyceræ, neu miserabiles
decantes elegos, cur tibi iunior
laesa præniteat fide:
insignem tenui fronte Lycorida
Cyri torret amor, Cyrus in asperam
declinat Pholoen: sed prius Apulis
iungentur capreae lupis,
quam turpi Pholoe peccet adultero;
sic visum Veneri, cui placet inpaes
formas atque animos sub iuga aenea
saevo mittere cum ioco.
ipsum me, melior cum peteret Venus,—
grata detinuit compede Myrtale,
libertina, fretis acrior Hadriae
curvantis Calabros sinus.

This poem, addressed to a famous brother-poet upon a supposed incident in his life and citing upon it the past experiences of the writer himself, bears as strong marks of personal identity between poet and speaker as the private sphere of the subject well allows. It would of course be vain

to exercise our imagination upon *Glycera* and *Myrtale*; the names declare themselves fictitious, the persons may be; but to read *ipsum me* without thinking of Horace is as impossible as to read *Albi* without thinking of Tibullus, and the last stanza, whether true or not of the actual Flaccus, refers plainly to the author of the *Odes*. Perhaps its full significance in this light has not been sufficiently recognized.

It is strange that in commentaries on the *Odes* of love the existence of such an institution as matrimony or of such a deity as Ἀφροδίτη Οὐρανία seems to be almost forgotten. "Mistress" "attachment" "liaison" are the whole staple of the vocabulary, and this is the more curious, because the inconveniences to which it leads have been fully perceived.

The author of the *Three Books* poses, and that not in one or two casual moments but in the beginning, end, and throughout, as the preacher—if it be permissible to borrow a not unfit term, we might say the 'prophet'—of moral reform. "We are a wicked generation, justly plagued for our transgressions" is the first note of his song¹. "Luxury and wantonness, wantonness and luxury, these are the curses of Rome"—such is the burden, repeated in all varieties, from the burning wrath of *Delicta maiorum* to the sharp rebuke of *Uxor pauperis* and the quiet gravity of *Inclusam Danaen*. And yet this Ezekiel not only is in practice a Béranger, but has so little respect for his robe, that he scarcely waits to kick it off before falling into a more congenial dance. No wonder that modern spectators should have stared, and sometimes frowned. The only wonder is that Augustus, the moral legislator, should have so warmly applauded the acting of a ἵποκριτής who does not impose for a moment upon us. We can see, even when the robe is on, that it does not fit; we do not miss the contrasts, even within the limits of a single piece, between the "official frigidity" and the "licentious vigour". Yet the emperor who, if he was himself the hypocrite that some think, at least knew how a great part should be played and played it earnestly and effectively for fifty years, pursued the poet with offers of friendship and insisted

¹ I. 2, I. 3; cf. III. 24.

that *he* must write the hymn of the new *Sueculum*, in which the boys and maidens of the nation, by the lips of their highest representatives, implored the Gods of purity to bless the reforming work of the imperial Apollo.

No doubt the Romans differed widely from us as to what a man might decently do, though not, before the Christian era, quite so widely as haste and prejudice sometimes assume¹. But this is no excuse, and is allowed to be none, for such breaches of taste as we suppose in the *Odes*. The author who assumes on one page to tax the world with iniquity becomes for literary purposes a law to himself, and if, on the next, he talks the language of a careless sinner, cannot plead that, in general, none is bound to profess himself a saint. Perhaps no great man of letters ever had less perception of fitness than Dryden, and it would be an insult to the coadjutors of Augustus to compare them for moral earnestness with the courtiers of Charles II. But even Dryden differentiates, and in his graver works contrives to be decent.

This double part in the *Odes*, the discord between the natural Horace and the political Horace, is often noted as an artistic defect. Nor is the assumption of its existence satisfactory as a theory in literary history. Before we regret or set ourselves to explain the separation, we should not only be quite sure that it exists, but should carefully measure it. Yet it is in vain that the poet proclaims himself 'the priest of the Muses', and declares that he sings 'to maidens and to boys', in vain that in poem after poem he writes of love and says nothing of himself or writes of himself and says nothing of love: he was a bachelor, we say, he describes himself in the *Satires* as no stricter than the average, Suetonius says he was thought to be even more loose, he published the *Epodes*,—ergo.

But in a court of literature neither the *Satires*, nor *Suetonius*, nor the *Epodes*, whatever they may really prove, are evidence as against the author of the *Odes*; upon such presumptions the *Night Thoughts* might be turned into profanity or the *Essay on Man* into ribaldry. Nevertheless the *Odes* are read as the work of a professed libertine, and every lady hitched into the verse

¹ On one source of error see Munro, *Elucidations of Catullus*, pp. 75 foll.

is at once asked for her 'marriage-lines'. Nay, she is not believed if she produces them. In I. 30 a certain *Glycera* summons Venus to enter a house or shrine prepared for her, and in her train among others

fervidus tecum puer et solutis
Gratiae zonis properentque Nymphae
 et parum comis sine te Iuventas
Mercuriusque.

Now we know that in ancient symbolism the conjunction of Aphrodite, Hermes, and the Charites signified *marriage*, and that this prayer therefore declares itself to be that of a married woman addressed, apparently on her marriage, to the Venus of *matrimony*. Orelli knows this, at least he cites from the Plutarchian *Maxims on Marriage* a passage which proves it¹; but this does not hinder him from bringing Horace upon the scene without a hint from himself, and inscribing the poem '*Glycerac amicae*', nor has it prevented others from gravely investigating the probable time and circumstance of this 'attachment'. When it fares so with a *Glycera* who is warranted respectable, it is not likely to go better with a *Glycera* who leaves her character to our charity, and the lady of the poem now before us has sometimes received little mercy. But she will stand cross-examination very well. Being *Glycera*, she is not Tibullus' *Delia* nor Tibullus' *Nemesis* and is not liable either to the hard or the soft impeachments which are made against those ladies. Her name as far as it goes is in her favour, for as it is honourable in I. 30, it is not in itself discreditable in I. 33. She has broken a promise to Tibullus, she has preferred a younger rival, and Tibullus is desperate. In a modern poem commencing thus, what should we suppose? Surely that the lady has placed between herself and the forlorn one the strongest of bars. And this natural supposition is really required, if the consolation

¹ οἱ παλαιοὶ τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τὸν Ἑρμῆν
 συγκαθίδρυσαν, ὡς τῆς περὶ τὸν γάμον
 ἡδονῆς μάλιστα λόγου δεομένης, τὴν τε
 Πείθω καὶ τὰς Χάριτας, ἵνα πείθοντες δια-
 πράττωνται παρ' ἀλλήλων ἃ βούλονται, μὴ

μαχόμενοι μηδὲ φιλονεικοῦντες. The
 bridal associations of the Greek
nympha imply the same. See the
Epithalamium of Catullus (61. 29).

offered is to be appropriate. The connexion I take to be this:—

“So, Albius, Glycera despite her promise has taken one nearer her years. Well, for you ‘Glycera’, with her sweet name, was but a ‘sour grape’. To console yourself, see what comes of an ill-assorted match. Look at beautiful Lycoris pining for Cyrus, while Cyrus turns aside after hard-favoured Pholoe, though till the doe couples with the wolf *she* will not yield to a seducer. With such cruel carelessness does the goddess of matrimony choose pairs for ‘the iron yoke’. I myself, though the goddess made me a better offer than this¹—would not, or could not, quit my mistress, a low-born woman, and more bitter than the sea which hollows the shore².”

¹ Literally “wooed me kinder (than as above described)”. Cf. i. 7. 25.

² The above differs somewhat from the general interpretation, though the difference is not here vital to the argument. Mr Page writes “Let not the memory of Glycera’s *cruelty* grieve you too much, Tibullus, and cease lamenting that you are outshone by a rival. *It*” *being crossed in love* “is a common case: Lycoris loves Cyrus, Cyrus loves Pholoe, and Pholoe thinks Cyrus detestable. Venus delights in cruel sport to yoke together those who will never make a pair. *The very same thing happened to myself, as to you*”; I have emphasized the points of difference. The difficulties I find in this are—(1) *immitis*: the play on *Glycera* shows that *immitis* has its proper sense of *sour, unripe* as in ii. 5. 9 *tolle cupidinem immitis uvae*, a precise parallel; it describes a girl too young to marry, or at all events too young for *Albius*, and so for him *unripe*; the common application of γλυκερὸς to fruit (cf. γλυκεροστάφυλος etc.) suggests that there is actually an allusion to the proverb. (2) the metaphor of *vr.* 10–12. The fact that A

pursues B is no reason for saying that A is *yoked* to B, still less that B is yoked to A (and *declinat* shows that Cyrus in the story is *yoked* to Lycoris, as well as L. to C.), least of all that A and B are yoked together *iugo aeneo* i.e., as Mr Page says in his note, “indissolubly”. In such a context the ‘iron yoke’ can have but one meaning, and I believe it has the same in iii. 9. 18; see hereafter. The case described is a complex illustration of the mischief made by bad marriages. Lycoris though beautiful and loving does not suit Cyrus, and he, who should have wedded Pholoe, has come too late. (*asperam* is untranslatable; it is at once uncomplimentary to Pholoe’s person and complimentary to her virtue.) The moral is that Albius need not regret having failed to gain a girl unfit for him in one respect at least, namely age; he has probably had an escape. (3) *adultero*, emphatic by position, shows that the love of Cyrus for Pholoe is a moral offence (cf. i. 15. 19, iii. 3. 25, iii. 6. 25, iii. 16. 4, iii. 24. 20. In i. 36. 19 the word is quite in keeping with the whole picture and

Thus it seems that Horace as author of the *Odes* here describes himself about his thirty-fifth year (such is the position of the poem¹) as already faltering a little in commending his choice of the bachelor estate. "Marriage is very hazardous; he had once a good chance, an unusually good chance, but—he was held by the 'pleasing fetters' of *Myrtale*². She was no lady; she preyed upon him." That was *his* history. And upon any construction, the attachment of which he speaks is past and is remembered with feelings, to say the least, very far from unqualified satisfaction.

The only other reference to the subject, if it be one at all, in the Three Books is in a poem (III. 14) which has scandalized even those who take the author of the *Odes* for a careless Lucio in matters of love.

Herculis ritu modo dictus, o plebs,
morte venalem petiisse laurum,
Caesar Hispana repetit penates
victor ab ora.
unico gaudens mulier marito
prodeat iustis operata sacris,
et soror clari ducis et decorae
supplice vitta
virginum matres iuvenumque nuper
sospitum. vos, o pueri et puellae
iam virum expertae, male ominatis
parcite verbis.
hic dies vere mihi festus atras
eximet curas; ego nec tumultum

should be taken as elsewhere in its full sense). If the point is merely that Pholoe dislikes Cyrus why is he called *turpis adulter*? (4) *melior Venus* should scarcely be dissociated from *sic visum Veneri*, the repetition of the name showing that the two phrases are connected. (5) the illustration from the experience of Horace is on this view not an illustration; Horace does not say he was crossed in love or that Venus yoked him to Myrtale; on the contrary he says *Venus* proposed, but Myrtale kept him

back.

¹ See Essay III. Tibullus was then about twenty-six; *Glycera* would be according to Italian notions fourteen at most.

² Her name, closely resembling that of the *μύρταλις* or 'thorny myrtle,' appropriately suggests a contrast with the *μύρτος* of Venus. The break in the logic of the last stanza—we should expect the conclusion "was deterred by the many examples of failure"—is intentional and in fact marks the point.

nec mori per vim metuam tenente
 Caesare terras.
 i, pete unguentum, puer, et coronas
 et cadum Marsi memorem duelli,
 Spartacum si qua potuit vagantem
 fallere testa.
 dic et argutae properet Neaerae
 Murrheum nodo cohibere crinem;
 si per invisum mora ianitorem
 fiet—abito.
 lenit albescens animos capillus
 litium et rixae cupidos protervae;
 non ego hoc ferrem calidus iuventa
 consule Planco.

"This ode," says Maclean, "has been animadverted upon pretty severely, and even rejected as spurious, because unequal to the occasion"; "it is not," subscribes Mr Wickham, "in Horace's best manner"; "and certainly," adds Mr Page, "not only are the three first stanzas utterly commonplace, but the contrast between their formal and official frigidity and the licentious vigour of the rest of the Ode is too harsh to be excused". But I would again ask, should not all this, taken with the words of Suetonius, *scripta eius Augustus adeo probavit...ut...saeculare carmen componendum iniunxerit*, make us doubt a little whether we in our readings of the *Odes* are always at the right point of view? The contemporaries of Vergil were not without a standard of fitness in treating of national themes. To write a fit hymn for a ceremony intimately connected with the honour of youthful chastity and married purity, a delicate taste is at least as necessary as a fine skill in metre. Yet the gross offence of which Horace is here pronounced guilty is after all only the most striking instance of that indifference to harmony in the moral tone, which would seem to be the character of his whole work. To pass in the course of two stanzas from official frigidity to licentious vigour is not much more crude than to double the parts of Jeremiah and Juan in successive poems. Granting that the author of the *Odes* had proved his unique mastery of the Sapphic, still if he was really capable of expressing in one breath his (formal) satisfaction at the return of the monarch to his family and his (real) delight in the prospect of a debauch,—

for this is the substance of the complaint—his *Carmen* might be expected to have defects more serious than a halting verse.

Now I have no wish to say that this poem is absolutely in the best taste. It touches frankly on a certain aspect of common life, which the practice of modern art agrees, or did agree, in excluding from poetry of such pretensions as the Books of *Odes*. But indecorum is not immorality; the moral effect of a work of art depends little on the thing represented but much on the light in which it is shown. If the true character of this poem is licentious vigour, then I do not see how querulous loneliness is to be depicted. To clear the ground, let us note first that the identity of the speaker is quite immaterial and cannot in fact be determined. The poem might be appropriately inscribed "Thoughts of an old bachelor, A. U. C. 730". There is nothing in it which might not be appropriately put into the mouth of any Roman gentleman whose hair was then turning white and who was without wife or family. It mentions no friend of the poet, none of his residences, no event or circumstance of his life. If Horace could have foreseen that the situation might appear unworthy of his assumed part, he could scarcely have been more careful not to commit himself. But whether the person whose feelings he paints be himself or no, the picture is not one which a wise moralist or a wise legislator would desire to cover. Let us consider the situation. The poet—if it be the poet—is some way past middle age. He has long outlived his illusions, the political as well as the personal passions of the great year 712, when Brutus was drawing young men to his standard with the names of Commonwealth and Freedom. He begins to feel somewhat old, and in matters of government cares chiefly for peace and protection¹. He is, as the whole poem implies, a confirmed bachelor. Caesar is coming, for the first time in the character of acknowledged sovereign, to the city which has become the capital of a monarchy; the loyalty of the Caesarean *populace* (*plebs*) assures him a hearty welcome,

¹ It is worth while to remember that when the *Odes* were completed, Caesar was again away and Rome in a state most uncomfortable for the quiet citizen.

and our bourgeois, though not exactly in the same temper, is ready to testify his sense of security. With just perception, he fixes upon *the family* as the bond of union between monarch and multitude. Caesar is coming to his *home* (*Penates*), he will meet his *wife*, he will meet his *sister*, and these illustrious joys will be repeated in all the meetings of mother and son, maid and lover, wife and husband, which the day will bring. How true this is to life, how well it hits the monarchical sentiment as felt by 'the masses', we need only read our newspapers and watch our own crowds to understand. That the expression of this sentiment does not show an enthusiastic sympathy with the populace, is quite true,—in fact the *dictus*, *O plebs*, of the first line is dangerously like a sneer, and the allusions to *vis* and *tumultus* in the fourth stanza not far from a snarl; but surely this is no accident. The speaker is *not* in harmony with the crowd. Nor is he altogether pleased with himself. Horace was not the genial man he is supposed to have been if, having described well or badly the general joy of such a home-coming, he could write

*ego nec tumultum
nec mori per uim metuam tenente
Caesare terras,*

without knowing that this somewhat acid satisfaction tastes ill after that of the *virgines*, *iuvenes*, *pueri* and *puellae*. However, this well-preserved egotist will not be dull any more than the rest; he will have perfumes, and wreaths, and the oldest wine to be found, and he will send for "Neaera", and (for he is working himself up and begins to fancy himself young) if her door-keeper resists, why—"force the door" should have followed¹, and would have followed "in the consulship of Plancus"; but it suddenly strikes him that really he does not now care a jot whether Neaera comes or no, and he drops plump into the bathos—"come away"², and ends with a half-amused growl—"there was a time when he would not have stood it". Whether

¹ Cf. III. 26. 10.

Mr Page in his paraphrase rightly inserts the dash.

² The change is well marked by the discord between punctuation and metre.

"it" refers solely to the conduct of Neaera's porter or includes the festivities of the imperialist mob, the reference to the year of Philippi leaves in convenient obscurity¹.

Surely this solitary grumbler is not, from the point of view of the *Marriage Laws*, an unedifying spectacle. Augustus might have desired that every middle-aged bachelor in Rome should publish invitations to "Neaera", on the condition that they should all be made so completely uninviting.

There is one thing in the poem or rather not in it, which, though it does not properly concern us here, is worth a pause. *Why no word of the emperor's daughter and his sister's son?* It was said before that the silence of the *Odes* on this subject (if we except one faint allusion) has been made an argument for placing the publication before Marcellus' death. Arguments from silence are commonly double-edged, and this one is sharp on the wrong side. Marcellus and Julia were married in 25, Agrippa filling the place of the absent father at the festivities in Rome². What could induce any one describing the meeting of the family in the next year, and publishing that description before Marcellus' death, to omit the chief figures of the picture; or if it was to be done, why make the absence so conspicuous by introducing the bridegroom's mother, the *soror clari ducis*, who appears here only in the work? The first three stanzas seem planned to force the name of Marcellus upon the lips, yet it does not come. But the "mute shadow" is there, one of the many ghosts which flit in the polished chambers of the *Odes*.

These poems, I. 33 (and III. 14?), contain the only references to personal relations between the author and women which, when

¹ It has often been pointed out that the reference to *Philippi* is calculated and marks the political change of the times, as well as the age of the speaker. But if so, *non ego hoc ferrem* is also ambiguous; and the truth is, the whole poem has the same doubtful colour. The speaker respects Caesar, but his feeling for the Caesarean *plebs* is between contempt and fear. The type was probably very common. How far

Horace himself was a representative of it, we do not know, nor does it signify. He may well have felt so on his *blue days*.

² Where Marcellus was at the time of the contract is not certain. It has been inferred from Dion 53. 26 that he was in Spain for part of the year 25, but the passage does not necessarily imply this.

he formed the collection, he thought fit to insert. In III. 21, one of the most distinctly personal poems in the book, anticipating the pleasure of a long night's talk with Messala Corvinus, he expresses the hope that *Venus* "if she is well-pleased" may help to pass the hours. Instantly the comment is ready, "*talibus enim conviviis inter amicos intimos celebratis faciles amicae adhibebantur, ut est aliquoties apud Horatium*". Really, if these people were not all dead, one might well be angry. The whole of the poem from the first line to the last is spent in showing that the enjoyment of these gentlemen will be a calm and decent enjoyment, worthy of the statesman and scholar who has drunk deep of philosophy: and yet the poet cannot express a modest hope that "Beauty" may consent to grace their conversation, without drawing down this "*faciles amicae*"! There is nothing in the piece which Wordsworth might not have written, in expectation of a visit from Mr and Mrs Southey, if they had been in the habit of sitting up late. But even with the help of such constructions as this, it is impossible to make a long case against the author of the *Odes*, so singularly careful is he in this respect. The First Book, for example, contains eleven poems which more or less clearly identify the speaker with Horace, namely I., III., VI.¹, VII., XVI. (?), XX., XXIV., XXVI., XXXI., XXXII., XXXIII., and sixteen poems bearing more or less on the relations of man and woman, namely V., VIII., IX., XI., XIII., XVI., XVII., XIX., XXII., XXIII., XXV., XXVII., XXIX., XXX., XXXIII., XXXVI. It will be seen that except in XXXIII. and XVI. (whose right to a place in the first set is very dubious) these two lists are mutually exclusive; in the two following books the division is sharper still.

If, however, the love-poetry of the *Odes* were in fact libertine, it would not signify much whether Horace himself figured in it or no. But in truth the chief apparent reason for thinking it so is the inveterate habit of reading 'ego' as 'Flaccus'. How

¹ The last words of this poem describe the character of lyric poetry in general, not the habits of the author; they are moreover, taken as an ac-

count of the *Odes* as a whole, untrue, and have the same ironical effect as II. 1. 37—40 and similar passages.

strongly this prejudice continues to act, in spite of the most formal renunciation, is curiously shown in a recent essay on the poet by a Continental critic¹, who, after pointing out the gross absurdity of the old realistic and biographical interpretations, proceeds on the very next page to contrast the "love-poetry of the moderns", which is for most part "merely the prelude to the wedding", with that of the Romans, Horace included, in which, "the girls being generally *hetaerae*, slave-women and freed-women, marriage is out of the question", and establishes this by the fact that "Horace, like most poets of his time, remained unmarried". What has this to do with the matter, since we are agreed that the lovers in the *Odes* are not all, and if not all then not any one, to be identified with Horace? This general presumption against the unlucky "girls", is, as far as the Three Books are concerned, not merely groundless but by the showing of the same writer disprovable. The character of the *hetaera* is much the same in all ages, and the poems of those Romans who write of her are full of "the standing complaint against the avarice of the fair and the power of gold", which "is hardly ever met" in the love-poetry of Horace.

When such persons as the *Cynthia* of Propertius occur there—which is not often—the attitude of the speaker is seldom that of the lover, never that of the accepted lover. Much rather is it that taken in I. 5, I. 8, I. 27, the cool observation of one who has 'seen the folly of it all', and pities the lads who are still believing in Pyrrha, wasting themselves on Lydia, or struggling in the grasp of "Charybdis". It is not easy to find in the Three Books a single poem painting licentious passion in its gay and attractive aspect², to set against those which make it terrible or ugly or ridiculous (I. 15, I. 25, III. 7, III. 10, III. 15, and the national poems *passim*). Even the somewhat brutal personage reprimanded in II. 5 is contemplating marriage (*v.* 16), and is promised more satisfaction in that condition than in his old

¹ Lucian Müller, *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Eine Litterarhistorische Biographie*, pp. 122—3.

² Whether the two withered and

hoary old reprobates of II. 11, with Iyde masquerading as a maid of Sparta, constitute such a picture, the reader must decide.

courses¹. As for Leuconoe (I. 11), Tyndaris (I. 17), Glycera (I. 19), Lalage (I. 22), Chloe (I. 23), and the rest, they are for anything shewn to the contrary "as honest as the skin between their brows". The only poems in the collection which can, in my judgment, be called licentious are I. 36 and III. 19, and it was for this reason I thought it of some interest to show that the persons who figure in I. 36 are not real but fictitious². The festivity projected in honour of Numida is, in plain words, a bestial orgy, and if Horace could grace it with the names of gentlemen, friends of his own and known to his readers, there is an end of all discussion as to the niceties of his taste. But it is one thing to say "So did my friends A and B", and another thing to say "Thus men do"; and if the figures of this picture are merely fictitious, the representation is not necessarily an offence against the severest canon³. And this is not all. The position of the poem shows that the author was not unaware of its quality. If we read the conclusion of the First Book beginning at XXXIV, and think of the thrilling catastrophe which it records, we must feel that between

quid intactum nefasti
liquimus?

on the one hand, and

quidlibet impotens
sperare fortunaque dulei
ebria

on the other, there is something to set the teeth on edge in

neu multi Damalis meri
Bassum Threïcia vincat amystide.

¹ The conclusion of this poem suggests a topic which cannot be discussed. To the Roman it was precisely on a par with other forms of irregular love, and is so treated in the few references which the *Odes* contain. It does not affect anything said above.

² See p. 131. Of III. 19 enough has been said already.

³ It is worth noticing that in I. 36,

by an extremely rare exception, *there is no first person and no one is addressed*. The speaker, if there is a speaker, takes no part in the prospective scene. Besides having a relation to the neighbouring poems, it is an excellent foil to II. 7, where Horace himself entertains a long-absent friend, and how differently! I. 36 is in truth a bitter satire.

omnes in Damalin putres
deponent oculos, nec Damalis novo
divelletur adultero
lascivis hederis ambitiosior.

The violence and offensiveness of the contrast has been felt often enough, but we tend to the inference that as the poet can be so grossly gay in XXXVI. the earnestness of XXXV. and XXXVII. is but half earnest. Obviously this is not the only possible interpretation of the facts.

Except in the false light cast upon the national poems by attributing to the others a tone which is not there, misconstruction does not do much mischief. But there are some of the love-poems themselves which suffer from it. It is injurious to the beautiful conclusion of I. 13,

felices ter et amplius
quos irrupta tenet copula nec malis
divulsus querimoniis
suprema citius solvet amor die,

and indeed to the whole of the poem. Surely it is a forced interpretation which would suppose this, than which nothing more worthy in praise of "the unbroken bond" was ever written, to be spoken by one whose object is just to supplant a drunken boy in the favour of an immodest girl. The speaker who there soliloquizes¹ neither is one of Lydia's ordinary lovers, nor has been, nor wishes to be. He is chained to her by a passion which makes him furious and miserable, which, if he could help it, he would not betray and which yet he strives in vain to suppress². He pities her and despises himself, and his sigh is for the happiness of those whose affections are better placed³. This stands alone among the love-poems of Horace for deep

¹ For the form of the soliloquy compare the poem of Sappho translated by Catullus. (Catullus XLIX).

² In the first two stanzas the punctuation is of some importance. The position of *cum* in v. 1 and *tum* in v. 5 shows that these clauses form one sentence, the exclamation *vae.. iecur* being a parenthesis. The struggling

wrath of the speaker is by no means all intended for *Lydia* and *Telephus*. Cf. Epod. XI. 15.

³ Horace has put something similar into his own mouth in *Epod.* XIV. : nothing seems to me less certain than that he always was or wished to be thought a *contented* libertine.

emotion; and though it is about as unlike Catullus as it could well be, I venture to think it would not be unworthy of him or of any man.

In the *Donec gratus eram* itself (III. 9) a presumption resting on the same base has exposed Horace to what is perhaps not wholly merited criticism. This little drama is taken as of course to present a *liaison*, the personages to have been formerly *amants*, to have had other *amants*, and to be now renewing their *amour*. If this is so, I do not see how for all its cunning workmanship it can claim a better verdict than Mr Munro's—"a neat enough mosaic"¹. He and she begin with loose charges; these charges are confessed, and they are quite happy. The details too are false. "Romana vigui clarior Ilia" is the lady's description of her happy days. "The fame of Roman Ilia! What's Ilia to her or she to Ilia?" asks Mr Munro, and I do not see how to answer, except by finding a character for Lydia which shall make Ilia a reasonable comparison. Now as Ilia was in the Roman calendar the type of matronhood and commemorated in the festival of the *Matronalia*², as she was first the victim of unjust persecution and afterwards the wife of an uxorious husband³, it seems that 'the fame of Roman Ilia' should mean 'wifely fame', and that Lydia's quarrel is therefore presumably a *matrimonial* quarrel. And upon this view it is not impossible to think the poem true as well as skilful. Mr Munro misses in it the "lyrical passion" of Catullus. But was Horace aiming at this and not rather at the different and inconsistent effect of humour? The passion of a man who praises Chloe *for skill on the harp* and then declares he would die for her sake is false passion; and if Horace meant it for true his admirable verses are bad poetry. But if it is meant for false, if all the imputations and self-accusations are false, and known to be so? "While I possessed you to myself" says the husband, with that amiable desire to be provoking which (on the stage, of course) husbands are known to exhibit, "I was wealthier than

¹ See *Elucidations of Catullus* p. 238.

² Ov. Fast. III. 234.

³ Od. I. 2. 17.

the King of the East"¹. "And I" says the wife, preferring (as on the stage always) retort to denial, "was the glory of matrons, till you cared less for Lydia than for Chloe"—a name apparently thrown out very much at hazard². "Chloe is my queen", says the husband, seeing his opportunity and embellishing the portrait suitably, "an *artiste*, an exquisite musician! I would die for her!" (Is it in human nature that any one but a wife should be alarmed or even annoyed by such language as this?) "Oh, I have a lover too" says she "he is So-and-so (*name very full*); and I would die for him too—twice." Lydia being now sufficiently out of temper and the point scored, the tormentor offers peace; and so of course an end, the whole thing being a mere flash of petulance on both sides.

But to fix the exact shade of colour in single poems is not the present object. Rather it is the collection as a whole which is now in view, and my point is that it does not belie the pretensions of the author to be the defender of morality. Compared even with modern work, not to say with that of Propertius, for instance, or Catullus (both in some ways better poets than Horace) the moral tone of the Three Books is very high—in the 'private' poems no less than in the 'public'. If it were permissible or in this case possible to interpret the author by our independent knowledge of the real man, I should agree with those who think that Horace respected and wrote for Augustus, because Augustus strove to be a moral reformer, much rather than with those who suggest that when he professes an interest in moral reform, it is because he was bound to please Augustus.

¹ On *Persarum...beatior* Mr Munro asks "What is there in the dull cold splendour and isolation of a Persian king to attract a real *lover*?" This, on the assumption, is quite just. But I submit that *beatior* means *wealthier* (rather than '*happier*') and that Horace uses 'Persian' here as elsewhere without reference to the Achaemenids in particular but simply for 'Oriental'. From the marital point of view a polygamous Eastern monarch is a very

proper symbol of wealth.

² If not, if Lydia really knows all about Chloe, what is the point of the circumstantial description given in reply? For the epithet *Thressa* and the supposed character of Chloe see on III. 10. 15 *vir Pieria pellice saucius*. On *Thurini Calais filius Ornyti* Ritter truly remarks that the full description is intended to give him reality. Lydia's attachment to him is a fiction, and the *puer* himself may be nothing more.

Motives, however, are no matter for literary judgment, and if the figure of Horace in his real character would have disturbed the harmony of the Three Books, it is all the better for literature that he is not there.

The orator who spoke of "this so-called nineteenth century" might in the same vein have blundered into a truth, if he had termed the later issue of Horace's Odes "the so-called Fourth Book". It is the fourth "book", but the second part. If we combined Milton's two epics into one 'Paradise' in four books, making three out of the earlier and one out of the later, we should have in mere structure a fair analogy to the actual form of the *Odes*. It is a work in three sections, with a sequel, and the relation of the sequel to the original is in all respects one of contrast. The cast of feeling, the political attitude, the personal circumstances of the poet, all are changed¹. Most propositions of importance which apply to the Three Books must be turned into the negative or otherwise modified when we come to the Fourth, and those of this essay are no exception.

Among other differences it has probably been often remarked that the tone of the sequel is uniformly natural. While in outward circumstance the poet's picture of himself shows us a greater and a richer man, while as the *Romanæ fidicen lyrae* he bears himself as becomes one from whom princes have not disdained to beg, the part of *the prophet* is dropped². Here we have no *Musarum sacerdos* inspired by profound feeling for the moral needs of the time, no fancied visions and dithyrambic raptures, no solemn warnings threatenings and rebukes. In the political view the Fourth Book is all *couleur de rose*; the salvation of society is accomplished; crime against the household is a thing unknown, and "we" speak of "our wives and children" as a matter of course³. The

¹ See Wickham *Introd. to Book iv.*

² Some traces of it may be found in iv. 6, but even there we scarcely quit

the region of fact. There is a broad difference between iv. 6 and iii. 1—6.

³ 5. 21, 15. 27, and *passim*.

desperate hope has become a solid certainty, and nothing remains to say but thanks for the realised happiness of a golden age begun. All this Horace can say perfectly well in his own garb of well-earned dignity, and this only he wears. Corresponding with this change of costume, so to speak, is the far greater prominence which his person has in the work. In the Three Books, as already observed, the poems which contain autobiographical touches are but a minority; there are considerable tracts in which the life of Horace may be completely forgotten¹, and the arrangement, so far from necessarily supposing the same speaker throughout, is designed to avoid this assumption². In the supplement, on the contrary, one figure and one speaker is always present—the author of the Three Books and the *Carmen Saeculare*. Of the fifteen poems which it contains, no less than eleven are assigned to this character by clear internal marks³, and the small remnant, comprising three of the four poems in which the Laureate executes his commission, cannot even in imagination be separated from the mass. And what is still more noteworthy, this personal character is expressly extended to the poems of love. Significant is the fact that the name of *Cinara*, a name, “which is perhaps redeemed” from merely fictitious existence “by the personal feelings which seem to accompany its mention and by its occurrence among the reminiscences of the poet’s own life in the *Epistles*”⁴ appears in the Fourth Book only. But the change is displayed by evidence much more salient than this. There is nothing in the Three Books at all resembling iv. 11. Here we have really what there we have not—a professed picture of the author in love, a real ‘invitation from Horace to his mistress’. It is instructive to contrast this simple drawing with the mock-pastoral tints of i. 17 and i. 22. The prefatory poem itself has its allusions to *Cinara* and *Ligurinus*, and these names, thus linked with his

¹ e. g. from i. 8. to i. 19, or from iii. 9 to iii. 15.

² To insist on a personal continuity from iii. 6. to iii. 10 would seem to me worse than superfluous. iii. 12 again appears to be the soliloquy of Neobule.

³ iv. 1. 2. 3. 6. 8. 9. 10 (by reference to iv. 1. 33). 11. 12. (if we may assume Vergilius to be a real person and a known friend of the poet) 13 (by reference to iv. 1—4). 15.

⁴ Wickham *Appendix I*.

own, he employs to preserve the personal colour in the tenth and thirteenth. Had the First Book been composed in this manner, scenes of love or scenes of quarrel with *Myrtale* should have occupied the place of I. 5, I. 8, and I. 11, and 'Maecenas atavis editus regibus' should have been addressed with a plea for irrepressible passions¹.

It may indeed occur to the reader that, upon this general view of the *Odes*, one name in the Fourth Book is strangely chosen. The triumph of the quondam lover over *Lyce*, grown old and practising vain arts upon contemptuous youth (IV. 13), is often described as a sequel to III. 10, where the suitor of the proud *Lyce* vainly supplicates in the snow before her gate. It may be said therefore that whatever of Horace IV. 1 contributes to IV. 13 must by a similar construction be extended from IV. 13 to III. 10. And here the long-repeated commentary, like the additions to the Edict, has so grown into the text, that I should hardly venture to question it, but for the qualification of Orelli's "*referri videtur ad Od. III. 10.*" But really the two poems are so ill-matched that the coincidence of name can scarcely have been meant to attract attention, and to make them parts of one story seems impossible. The coincidence in itself proves nothing, for the *Phyllis* of IV. 11 has no connexion with the *Phyllis* of II. 4. The characters have simply no resemblance. The *Lyce* of III. 10 is a married lady of incorruptible virtue; she of IV. 13 has been the mistress of the poet and is classed along with Cinara the *rapax*: this one was of old a sedulous and artful captivator of youth, the other is completely (and very properly) indifferent to her vicious suppliants. The mere fact that *Lyce* I is married, if it does not prove her another person from *Lyce* II, does sufficiently show that her would-be seducer is not meant for Horace². Nor are the scenery or the expressions of the later poem adapted to the supposed contrast. "*Audivere, Lyce, di mea vota*"—but in III. 10 there are no "*vota*". There the tempter is left shivering in the wind and rain; if the object of IV. 13 had

¹ See I. 33 and *supra* p. 152.

² *Sat.* II. 7. 72. There is nothing

in Horace's works to impeach this denial.

been to show the tables turned, the lady (I beg her pardon for the imagination!) should have been presented in such circumstances as in i. 25 are anticipated for *Lydia*¹, a creature who would indeed suffer nothing by association with the old crow Lyce and "the dear departed Cinara". Lastly, if the scheme of the Three Books be rightly represented in Essay III—and there is more evidence for it than will be outweighed by the recurrence of a name—dates are decisive, for there cannot be more than a dozen years between the two scenes.

To return—the difference between the poet's presentation of himself in the two parts of his work is certainly not due to any change in his political judgment, or any desire to recant his praises of moral reform. On the contrary the later part is the more 'Augustan', and the sanctity of the family life is extolled as much as ever. The change is not in the sentiments but in the point of view. To rebuke a vicious nation and to praise a reformed nation are consistent parts, but require a different deportment. In paying a compliment to the general virtue of society, it is permissible, even graceful, to say frankly that your private standard has been rather below than above the average; but the censor, though he may confess his particular weakness, is in decency bound to deplore it. The Horace of the Fourth Book is, I should imagine, a very fair portrait, presenting, according to the ideas of the time, just a dignified and respectable bachelor of fifty, such as would remain here and there even among the 'most married' people. He speaks reverently of the nuptial tie, and does not conceal that he feels himself rather superannuated and melancholy², though a weak tear or a foolish dream still sometimes reminds him of what he was³, and on the birth-day of an old friend he will still send for 'Phyllis' to sing away dark thoughts. He notes with bitter exultation how time has avenged him on the false charmer who 'stole him from himself'⁴, and can scarcely grieve

¹ *invicem moechos anus arrogantes
flebis in solo levis angiportu,
Thracio bacchante magis sub inter-
lunia vento.*

² iv. 1. 29—32, iv. 11. 35, iv. 12. 19 and 26. The same tone runs through iv. 7. iv. 10 and iv. 13.

³ iv. 1. 33—40.

⁴ iv. 13. 20. The pluperfect is noticeable; it seems, like the perfect in '*terra tremit; fugere ferae*', to imply that the thing was done in a moment; he had no chance.

that she whom he loved best did not live to become such a wreck. His best pleasure is in contemplating the martial and the peaceful glories of the renovated state, and in the consciousness that he has adorned and still is able to adorn it. The Horace of the Three Books is indeed a study from the same original, but for another picture and in a different manner. In a season of private sorrow and public disorder, the censor of human foibles, the author of *causeries* and *pasquinades*, takes up his parable in a fresh strain. Relying on the highest political and literary sanction, he puts forth what, with characteristic irony, is advertised as a successful experiment in the metres of the Greek erotics, but is in reality for much better reasons a 'monumentum aere perennius', a monument of sympathy with a sorely stricken benefactor, and a monument also of an ever-memorable passage in the history of mankind. It is, in the metaphor of the epilogue, a series of sculptures in the 'bronze' of lyric verse, presenting the life of Rome during twenty years of labour towards a deliverance, not yet complete, from the burden of discord, anarchy, and profligacy. To the finishing of this design chance had contributed a terrible aid by bringing the poet into close connexion with a conspicuous and tragic figure, who was the very personification of his idea. His portrait of himself, as well as the miscellaneous pictures real and fictitious which reproduce the variety of life, is not falsified, but adapted to the work by a choice of light. His moderate desires, warm affections, wide sympathies are appropriate traits, and these are set in view. Of what might have been less suitable he has said little, and that little without bravado and without hypocrisy, but with a becoming suggestion of honest regret.

EUTERPE.

WHATEVER laxity in moral æsthetic we may justly or unjustly attribute to the poet of the *Odes*, there is no doubt as to the strictness of his literary conscience in the technical finish of language and metre. That the problem of adapting the rhythms of Sappho, Alcaeus, Archilochus to a language as different from theirs as well might be, of persuading *Euterpe* to open the pipe and *Polyhymnia* to string the lyre, taxed him to the utmost fidelity of ambitious effort, his work, even without his prologue, would assure us. His models being almost entirely lost, his processes, for the most part, cannot be followed. Something, however, of the principles we can see, and I propose to say a few words here on his treatment of the junctures between verse and verse—that *συνάφεια* which in Greek art is of so much importance¹. (For various reasons the ‘Sapphic’ is

¹ On this subject see Christ, *Metrik* (1879), pp. 38 foll. 544 foll. His conclusion is, that while Catullus wrote Sapphics in continuous metre, Sappho, Horace and the rest permitted syllables of doubtful quantity at the end of the verse and hiatus between the verses. If this were all, it might be inferred, and apparently is generally inferred, that the matter is concluded by saying there is no *synaphea*. The reader will judge how far this is actually the case. I ought perhaps to warn him from the whole subject and from this essay, if he does not happen to be interested in the niceties of euphonious sound; although to the full appreciation of Augustan poetry some interest in it is

indispensable. It is important to remember that much Latin poetry, and the lyrics of Horace especially, were meant primarily not for silent reading, but for reciting and hearing, as were also those of his models the Greek lyrists. To feel all that there is in a passage of Horace it must be declaimed aloud—better, it is well to add, in the ‘new’ pronunciation. All sorts of consequences follow from this fundamental distinction between the ancient lyric and the modern, the chief for us at present being that to make a sharp division, regardless of sense, at brief intervals determined by the length of the ‘line’ is inexpedient. In verse meant to be perused or to be

a convenient base, and except when otherwise stated the remarks which follow refer to the 'Sapphic' poems.)

So 'learned', in their own favourite phrase, were the Augustan poets, and so patient of labour, that there is hardly any limit to the nicety of conscious or unconscious observance which is revealed by a close examination of their work. In the matter before us, the precision of Horace, when the occasion justifies the severest form, is something almost miraculous. The *Carmen Saeculare* consists of 76 lines. It is written—with a single exception to be noticed presently—in metre continuous from beginning to end (technically speaking, in strict *synaphea*), a thing in itself proving some conscious or instinctive care, as the reader may satisfy himself by comparing the modern 'Sapphics' of all but the most exquisite scholars. But this is nothing. From the modification made by Horace in the single Sapphic *line* it is a corollary, that if the quatrain is continuous, the final syllable in each of the three Sapphic lines is not indifferent in quantity, but must as a rule be long; and where the stanzas are continuous with one another, the same applies to the last syllable of the fourth line too. Sappho's stanza, it will be remembered is

⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ (Sapphic verse, 3 times),

⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ ⋈ (versus Adonius).

In the single verse the change of quantity (amounting to a

sung, this is permissible; in words meant to be spoken, and written on a system of quantity, some sort of continuity, some regard to the 'junctures,' becomes a necessity.

The following figures may be useful for comparison. They do not for obvious reasons represent the result of absolute chance, but are as near an approach to it as can be obtained in Latin metre. They are taken respectively from (i) a casual 100 lines in the *Aeneid* (supposed for argument's sake metrically continuous with one another), (ii) 100 in Lucretius. The five

cases are (1) long vowel before consonant, (2) vowel long 'by position', (3) short vowel before consonant, (4) long vowel before vowel (collision), (5) short vowel before vowel (hiatus).

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I.	54	15	12	15	4
II.	51	19	18	7	5

See also the facts from the *Epodes* stated hereafter. It should perhaps be added that in the cases (4) and (5) punctuation appears to have no effect. The *collision* (or *hiatus* as the case may be) is absolute.

total change of rhythm), which Horace made, was to lengthen the fourth syllable *always*, instead of only by way of variety. Whatever his motive for this, the effect of it is that whereas in Sappho the basis of the verse is the double trochee $\text{—} \cup \text{—} \cup$, in Horace this sequence is not allowed, but becomes $\text{—} \cup \text{—} \text{—}$. If then the whole stanza is to be treated on the same principle, the other syllable 'common' in the Sapphic verse, the last, must be lengthened likewise, otherwise we should have two, indeed three, trochees in succession. Now in the *Carmen*, out of 57 Sapphic verses 51 have the final syllable long, and to make sure that the general regularity shall be perceptible to the ear, there is a regularity in the exceptions themselves; for 5 of the 6 are in the first verse of the stanza (one in the first of the poem), and of these 4 consist of the same word (*que*)¹. (It is not for the present the question whether so much accuracy is desirable; we shall see that Horace knows how to depart from it; the first thing is to ascertain the rule) But even this is not quite enough for him. There is still the distinction between the two kinds of long syllables, that which cannot be short, and the 'long by position'. Of these two there is no question which is the most effectually long. If we compare the sound of the two sentences

sive quos Elea domum reducit
palma caelestes

and

condito mitis placidusque telo
supplices audi

reciting them carefully, it is plain that, though both these syllables are 'long' in the sense of 'not short', the extra weight in *telo* is not lost. Of the 51 long finals above mentioned 47 are such as could never be short, and of the 4 others 2 are protected against abbreviation by triple, not double, consonants². All this is of course not perceived in reading or reciting, but the result is felt in a certain unimpeachable correctness, which is for itself worth something in a ceremonial piece. But now as to the one breach of continuity. It occurs at the 60th verse,

¹ Carm. S. 1, 17, 37, 50, 57, 69.

² See Carm. S. 3, 42, 43, 67.

apparetque beata pleno
copia cornu. |
augur et fulgente decorus arcu etc.

Seeing that 'hiatus' is a negative term, meaning the neglect of elision where it ought to take place, and that in the lyrical prosody of Horace such an elision as *corn' augur*, even in the same line and sentence, is inconceivable, it would not be very strange if the place of this division were not specially appropriate. But it is, as a glance over the poem will show. However the hymn was distributed in detail for the purpose of singing, it is clearly divided as a poem into three main parts; the first two stanzas are the opening, the last four the conclusion¹. These two parts are distinguished from the central and discursive portion by the invocation of the patron deities under their proper correlative names of *Phoebus* and *Diana*, which are introduced in the opening, then dropped for thirteen stanzas (8—60), then resumed (62, 70) and repeated in the close (75). In the last stanzas of the central part the stream of the subject flows at its widest; at 60 it suddenly converges again upon the patron and patroness of the festival. To the proper effect of recitation (as distinct from musical setting) a full pause at *cornu* is essential; and the exception is used to mark it.

Thus the *Carmen Saeculare* gives us, as the standard of Horace in the Sapphic metre, the following rules:

- (1) the normal stanza has the quantities of these,

fertilis frugum pecorisque tellus
spicea donet Cererem corona;
nutriant fetus et aquae salubres
et Iovis aurae.
condito mitis placidusque telo etc.

(2) both the lines and the stanzas are normally continuous in metre, but

(3) deviations from this rule may be permitted or required by the sense.

We have here the advantage, I think unhappily unique, of possessing for comparison one complete poem in the same metre

¹ This is I think a common feature of all schemes.

by a Greek artist whom Horace had in view. I speak of course of Sappho's prayer to the goddess of love.

Ποικιλόθρον', ἀθάνατ' Ἀφροδίτα,
 παῖ Δίος, δολόπλοκε, λίσσομαι σε,
 μή μ' ἄσαισι μήτ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα,
 πότνια, θῦμον·
 ἀλλὰ τυῖδ' ἔλθ', αἶ ποτα κατέρωτα
 τᾶς ξμας αὖδως αἶτοισα πῆλυι
 ἔκλνες, πάτρος δὲ δόμον λίποισα,
 χρύσιον ἦλθες
 ἄρμ' ὑπαγεύξαισα· κάλοι δέ σ' ἄγον
 ὥκεες στρουῖθι περὶ γᾶς μελαίνας
 πύκνα δινεῖντες πτέρ' ἀπ' ὠράνῳ αἴθε-
 ρος διὰ μέσσω.
 αἶψα δ' ἐξέκοντο· τὸ δ', ὦ μάκαιρα,
 μειδιάσας' ἀθανάτῳ προσώπῳ,
 ἦρε', ὅττι δηῦτε πέπονθα κῶττι
 δηῦτε κάλῃμι,
 κῶττ' ἔμψ μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι
 μαινόλα θύμῳ· τίνα δηῦτε Πείθῳ
 μαῖς ἄγην ἐς σὰν φιλότατα, τίς σ', ὦ
 Ψάπφ', ἀδικήει;
 καὶ γὰρ αἱ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει,
 αἱ δὲ δῶρα μὴ δέκετ', ἄλλα δώσει,
 αἱ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει
 κῶνκ ἐθέλοισα.
 ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, χαλεπᾶν δὲ λῦσον
 ἐκ μερμῶν, ὅσσα δέ μοι τέλεσσαι
 θυμός μ' ἐρῶν, τέλεσον· σὺ δ' αὐτὰ
 σύμμαχος ἔσσο¹.

¹ "O dight with many a flower," (or "Throned in broidery") immortal Aphrodite, child of Zeus, weaver of wiles, I beseech thee, break not my heart, lady, with weariness and with pain. But hither come, if ever other whiles, hearing my voice from far, thou didst hearken, and leaving thy father's house didst come in car of gold, which with quick-beating wings thy pretty team of swift birds drew o'er dark earth from heaven through mid air: soon they arrived; and thou, blest lady, with a smile on thine immortal face, would'st ask what now had be-

fallen me, and why I called thee now, and what for my wild heart I would most fain were done; 'Whom now must Suasion bring unto thy love, or who, my Sappho, does thee wrong? For though they fly, soon shall they pursue, and though they took not gifts, yet gifts shall they bring, and though they kiss not, soon shall they kiss, willing or no.'—Come also now and from sore sadness set me free, and all that my heart yearns to see accomplished, accomplish thou: thou be thyself my champion".

Now it will be perceived that this exquisite poem has, in the arrangement and construction of its parts, a certain peculiarity, upon which its unity of effect in a measure depends. It consists in reality of a single sentence in two parts, the first stanza and the remainder. The last stanza is continuous in sense not with the last but one, but with the second, ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν answering to αἶ ποτα κατέρωτα...ἦλθες and being a resumption of ἀλλὰ τυῖδ' ἔλθε. The third, fourth, fifth and sixth stanzas are a narrative which develops out of the second; and if they were omitted, the poem would have precisely the same outline which it has now. To the rhetoric of the piece, therefore, a pause before the last stanza, where the speaker is changed from Aphrodite back to Sappho, is absolutely necessary; and this pause is marked by the metre. The hiatus between a long sound and a following vowel (which for convenience we will henceforth call a *collision*) is permitted freely at the ends of the verses (it is not excluded in Greek lyric metres even within the verse); but the hiatus between a vowel *short* (and therefore liable to be elided) and a following vowel, a *hiatus* in the strict sense, occurs only once, and that is where it ought to occur, before the last stanza¹. The piece is thus written in verse not mechanically continuous, but obeying, by conscious art or felicitous instinct, the inner law of the meaning; and we may well guess that this and other like facts did not escape the notice of such students as the Roman poets. The observance of some such restrictions would indeed be imperious to a sensitive ear, in a metre which allowed such combinations as

τίς σ' ὦ
Ψάπφ' ἀδικήει;

The last line in the Sapphic stanza is for every purpose continuous with the third, which is itself a reason for not treating the two first as absolutely independent units.

For those then who essayed to latinize Sappho, the first

¹ That ἔλθε had for Sappho no initial sound which could prevent elision is shown by v. 5. It may be noted that in v. 11 the final ω (as a

vowel probably near our oo) of ὥρῳ was apparently sounded as something resembling our w.

problem was,—how were the junctures to be treated? Was there to be absolute continuity, or not? Catullus, as we know, in his translation from the Greek poetess¹, and in the one other poem which he essayed in the metre, declared for absolute continuity. What he might have done, if he had translated the prayer to Aphrodite, which is not continuous and would be injured if it were, we may conjecture from the following version of the two last stanzas—

‘Num fugit? iam iam, fugiat, sequetur:
dona contemnit? dare perget ultro:
non amat? iam iam, velit ipse nolit,
discet amare.’
Adveni vel nunc, et amara nobis
solve curarum: rata cuncta sunt
quae cor exoptat rata: diva mecum
stare memento².

At all events this, or something like it, is what Horace would have approved, as the *Carmen Saeculare* shows.

It now remains to see in what manner Horace, having got the full benefit of his rule, also gets, as the artist should, the benefit of neglecting it upon good cause. But I must first remind the reader once more of a fact which works on ancient metre do not always recognize, that the classification of vowels into ‘long’ and ‘short’ is an extremely rough division, and not at all an adequate rendering of the distinctions necessary to art. The measure of the offence to the ear given by the collision of a ‘long’ vowel sound with a following vowel is the inclination, produced by the habit of the language or the practice of the writer, to elide the first sound. For example, Horace in his lyrics scarcely ever elides the diphthong *ae*, perhaps never at all³. There is therefore the very minimum of collision in such junctures as

¹ The poem translated (Sapph. frag. 2), or rather what we have left of it, has no *hiatus*.

² Munro’s *Translations* (privately printed in 1884), which I have permission to quote. There is no other *hiatus* in Mr Munro’s Latin; there are

two collisions, both such as Horace admits, though that in v. 13 (*refuso os*) would perhaps not have contented him in that place. This subtle conformity with the original appears to be instinctive.

³ In III. 8. 27 *et* (omitted by Nauck)

unde vocalem temere insecutae
 Orphea silvae,
 arte materna rapidos morantem
 fluminum lapsus,

though Horace is very sparing even of these¹. Nor in the case of poetry so frankly imitated from a foreign language as the *Odes* is the word in which the collision takes place an insignificant matter. Sappho would, as we have seen, have felt nothing harsh in collision after *μύρτω, πόντῳ, Αἴμῳ*: and this lessens the surprise to the ear when *myrto, ponto, Haemo* are treated in the same way². Nor, of course, is the vowel which follows indifferent³. And it will be found that, in all his metres, Horace, as a general rule, allows collision, even at the junctures, only between such syllables of such words as he certainly would not have elided. Lastly, the total number of collisions admitted is relatively very small. The Sapphic poems contain altogether some 850 lines. I have noted seven cases of *hiatus*⁴ (including in *hiatus* such junctures as *decorũm. | O decus*), all at strong stops where we might naturally place a note of exclamation, and 25 cases of collision, of which almost all coincide with a stop. Moreover there is (as is well known by tradition among writers of "composition" though I am not aware that the bearing of the facts has been worked out) clear evidence of a development of doctrine on the point. The nearest approach to arbitrary breach of continuity which Horace ever presents is *collision* (not *hiatus*) within a sentence, such as

is unnecessary and the MSS. evidence is against it. Besides there is considerable reason for thinking that, where such combinations as *leto et, ictu et* form a dissyllable, it was not the long vowel which was extinguished but the *e* of *et*. In III. 4. 78 for *nequitiae additus* the correction *nequitiae datus* might seem certain, were it not for *flagitio additis* in III. 5. 26. But here also I believe Horace to have used *datis* as a poetical variety for the more prosaic compound.

¹ I. 2. 6, *ib.* 16, I. 12. 7, *ib.* 8, I. 30. 6, II. 4. 6.

² I. 12. 6, *ib.* 31, I. 25. 18.

³ There is a possible example of collision within the verse between *two similar vowels* (in *Alcaics* as it happens) in II. 20. 13 *Daedaleo* (Greek word) *ocior*. Between the verses it occurs, in *Sapphics*, at I. 2. 41, II. 2. 6, II. 8. 16, III. 11. 50. On this species of collision in general see Christ, *Metrik*, p. 41.

⁴ I. 12. 40, I. 32. 12, II. 6. 8, II. 16. 28, II. 8. 8, III. 27. 36, IV. 11. 12.

et minax, quod sic voluere, ponto
unda recumbit

or,

otium bello furiosa Thrace,
otium Medi pharetra decori

or,

cuius recinet iocosa
nomen imago,
aut super Pindo gelidove in Haemo?

Now out of the cases (14 or 15) of this, *two-thirds* occur in two poems, I. 2. and I. 12, containing together about *one-eighth* of the whole quantity of Sapphic verse. The opening of I. 12 (1—12) is in this respect an excellent example of what the practice of Horace *is not*; the passage is saturated with Greek colour, and the collisions are in keeping. When it is seen that these poems are *the first two of a historical series*, we may certainly say that these peculiarities are not accidental, though to draw any precise conclusion from them would be unsafe. Except in these two, collision in the Sapphic is almost entirely confined to strong stops¹.

But now, to turn from the material of art to the product, let us consider the metrical treatment of III. 11, the poem of the *Danaïds*. Their story, or rather that of the 'one faithful found', is itself the chief motive of the piece; but, by way of setting, we have a speaker and a listener; the one a playful girl, too young for thought of marriage and unassailable from mere youth, but therefore not too old to be moved by an old tale well told; the other an admirer—a lover scarcely yet—who invokes Mercurius, the giver of persuasion, to aid him in attracting at least her attention. The thought of the god's power calls up the legend how Hades itself and the weary sufferers were charmed by the spell of his song; and straying among these visions in a sort of soliloquy, the would-be wooer lights upon the Danaïds. The story of the Danaïds, perhaps Lyde will listen to that! *Audiat Lyde scelus*—and forthwith

¹ Add to previous references I. 2. 47, III. 27. 10, *ib.* 33., *C. S.* 60. On I. 2. I. 12. 4, I. 22. 15, II. 6. 12, II. 16. 5, 47 see hereafter.
III. 8. 9, III. 11. 29, *ib.* 32. III. 14. 4,

follows the well-known version. (It is sometimes asked what is the moral of the story in the case supposed, but why should it have any? It is an *interesting* and *pathetic* story, which is enough for such a listener as Lyde; and on the other hand "pity moves the mind to love". The scene is not unlike that of Coleridge's *Genevieve*.) Such being the scheme, it will be seen that the effect of the piece turns mainly on *the commencement of the tale*, which, to catch a careless ear, must be as impressive as possible. Now for the metre. The poem has 52 lines¹, continuous except in three places. Having noted this let the reader *recite* the following stanzas, marking interruptions where Horace has placed them:

audiat Lyde scelus atque notas
 virginum poenas et inane lymphæ
 dolium fundo pereuntis imo,
 seraque fata
 quæ manent culpas etiam sub Orco!—
 Impiæ (nam quid potuere maius?)
 impiæ sponso potuere duro
 perdere ferro!—
 Una de multis face nuptiali etc.

No device of punctuation can adequately represent the force which this bold outline of the coming story gains from the pause which precedes and the pause which follows. When therefore we find close to the end another, the only other, collision in the piece, we cannot reasonably suppose it accidental, especially as it is of that type (the collision within the clause) which has been shown to have so restricted a field. But again, to see the purpose, it is only necessary to read the lines aloud and to let the voice falter where euphony prescribes. The newly married wife is bidding good speed to the plighted lover whose life she saves, and from whom she is parting for ever;

i pedes quo te rapiunt et auræ
 dum favet nox et Venus, i *secundo*...
 omine et nostri memorem sepulcro
 scalpe querellam².

¹ Including the possibly spurious
 17—20.

² There are two questions on this stanza perhaps worth raising, (1) What

Throughout the *Odes* and in all metres Horace has paid attention to the junctures. For example in I. 32 the collision at v. 12 marks the only full stop in the piece, and (like that in IV. 3. 16) gives a pause before the concluding invocation. In I. 33 the two central and closely connected stanzas are so stopped off from the first and last; II. 8 is divided into three equal groups of 8 lines, each pair of stanzas closely connected in sense; III. 20 into two such groups. A particularly neat instance of exactness occurs in II. 19. In the Alcaic stanza as Horace writes it the final syllables of the first two lines are, of course, not indifferent in quantity but must be normally long. If they were *frequently* short all sense of the trochaic rhythm would soon be lost. In fact from the second syllable of the first (Alcaic) line to the sixth of the third (both inclusive) the Alcaic metre is *in mere quantities* the same as the Sapphic, though the ictus and division at the end of the first two lines is occasionally allowed to lengthen a syllable which would in itself be short¹. Now II. 19, a highly 'poetic' piece which, from many small indications, has evidently been composed with scrupulous care as to metrical effect (note, for instance, the perfect euphony of

does *pedes* mean here (and in Epod. XVI. 22)—*feet* (so that the sense is 'by land or sea') or (as *utrumque pedem* in Catullus IV. 20) *sheets* (of the ship)? A comparison of Catullus with the Epode shows a considerable resemblance (note *vocaret aura*—*Notus vocabit*) and suggest that Horace had actually Catullus in mind: and whatever the meaning in the Epode, it is evidently the same here. Further, the introduction of the *feet* seems in the Epode decidedly out of place, while here *classe*, suggesting the sea, leads quite naturally up to the other meaning. (2) *Venus* is, I presume, "the star of love all stars above"; her presence is the *omen*, and adds to the picture.—Out of I. 2 and I. 12 there are no collisions in *Sapphics* not justified by an important stop, except I. 22. 15, III. 27. 10, and *ib.* 33. The first

and third may possibly be recommended by some literary reminiscence now not recognizable.

¹ II. 11 is in this and many other respects a good example of normal *Alcaics*. The first six *Odes* of Book III. contain 168 such final syllables. Of these all but 12 either must be (or as in III. 1. 9 might be by ictus) long irrespective of their place in the verse: chance would have given us four times the number of 'shorts'—probably much more, to judge by some modern '*Alcaics*'. III. 26 has an unusual number. In some cases the syllable is apparently meant to be short, e.g. in III. 1. 25, where the rhythm is *desiderantem quod satis est—neque tumultuosum*, not *desiderantem quod satis est neque—tumultuosum*.

the vowel-collision in *trilingui ore*), has what might appear one irregularity—the short final syllable in

tu cūm paréntis régna per árduúm
cohórs Gigántum scánderet impiá
Rhoetum retorsisti etc.

But this *is* lengthened ‘by position’ before the Greek aspirated *ρ* in *Rhoetum*. Another example, of a different kind, appears in III. 13, *O fons Bandusiae*. A glance will show that final syllables of the verses are generally long; those which are not so by the ‘nature’ of the vowel-sound are protected by piles of stops and consonants (*floribus, cras—cornibus primis—destinat: frustra—gregis. te*). Two, however, not only may be short by the quantity of the vowel but occur in places where the sense forbids a pause; and these two *are placed symmetrically*, in the second lines of the two central stanzas. The conclusion to which this directs the reciter is that, as the metre of those stanzas is different from that of the other two, the rhythm is different, and that the proper metrical beat is

inficiét tibi
rúbro sángine rívos

and

fríguis amábile
féssis vómere taúris

(not *inficiét tibi—fríguis amábile*). Thus the little piece has a ‘strophic’ arrangement, the stanzas answering in the order ABBA, much to the advantage, if I do not mistake, of its effect upon the ear¹. Many more illustrations might be given, but I

¹ So III. 9 is strophic, the order of stanzas being AA, BB, BA. So is I. 14, with the order AA, BB, C; the final syllables of vv. 9 and 13 are lengthened by the stops, but those of vv. 4 and 8 are really short, the rhythm being *rémigió latus ét—imperiósius aéquor*. So I. 23 is strophic in two ways; in rhythm the correspondence is ABB, while the collision at v. 7 echoes that at v. 3, both obviously marking rhetorical starts; thus the

central stanza answers to the first in one way, to the third in another. So *was*, I believe, I. 33; with the order AABB. As it stands v. 11 does not correspond to v. 15, but this is an added reason for suspecting that *saevo* in 12 is an error for *scaevo* ‘*maladroit*’, which would lengthen the final vowel of *aenea*. So is I. 5, in the order ABAB; but with a variation in v. 12, where the beat on the final syllable is altogether suppressed, to make room

will not further pursue a subject which the reader can easily investigate if he pleases.

A word or two may perhaps be said on the *punctuation* of the *Sapphic*. A little consideration of the metre, or, better, the reading of a few poems aloud with attention to the continuous rhythm, will show that there is one place in each of the three *Sapphic* verses where a strong stop cannot stand without harsh effect, namely after the third syllable. By regularly lengthening the fourth syllable, as Horace does, the quasi-trochaic character of the verse is already much impaired. If the 'spondee'¹ in the second foot is further weighted by a pause in the middle of it, the verse collapses. This, for instance—

hoc tene;—Sapphus imitator odit
Creticum²; non constat Horatiano
carmini. tu sic monitus caveto
scindere versus—

cannot be called a *Sapphic* stanza at all. Between the rhythm and the punctuation there is a hopeless dilemma, and whichever we choose the result is absurd. Accordingly no stop but the slightest (and that with caution and judgment) is allowed in this place by Horace as a rule. Of course this, like everything else, may be done, if there is cause; where the verse ought to be broken, it may be. Thus in four places this division helps to mark a parenthesis, which is by nature a breach of continuity—

impiae,—nam quid potuere maius—
impiae sponsores etc.³.

On the same principle the stop is just, where the 'cretic'

for the exclamatory emphasis on *miseri*. For the metrical beat must surely be *fállacís. miserí—quibus íntentáta* (not *miserí quibús—íntentáta*.) But in fact this subject is too large for a note.

¹ It is not of course really always a spondee, but sometimes a spondee,

∠∠, more often a quasi-trochee ∠ —.

² pes Creticus = — ∪ —.

³ III. 11. 30; this poem is a perfect cabinet of metrical gems. See also *ib.* 1, I. 12. 31 and IV. 11. 34. The first of Mr Munro's two stanzas cited on p. 179 illustrates the next note.

contains in itself a whole condensed and emphatic sentence or clause, as in

ulla si iuris tibi peierati
poena, Barine, nocuisset unquam,
dente si nigro fieres vel uno
turpior ungui,
crederem.—sed tu etc.

Here the humorous surprise largely depends for its effect on the metrical dislocation which follows it¹. Or the check may assist the expression in some other way, as in

quem vocet divum populus ruentis
imperi rebus? prece qua fatigent
virgines sanctae minus audientem
carmina Vestam?
cui dabit partes scelus expiandi
Iuppiter?—tandem venias precamur etc.,

where, in the momentary pause, the speaker as it were looks round for sign of a response². Or as in II. 10. 13—18 (a passage which in four lines has four unusual breaks),

sperat infestis, metuit secundis
alteram sortem bene praeparatum
pectus.—informes hiemes reducit
Iuppiter,—idem
submovet.—non si male nunc et olim
sic erit.—quondam cithara tacentem
suscitat musam, etc.

where, to give the natural emphasis to a string of proverbial 'sentences', the verse is very properly cut to pieces. The famous 'sentences', which Polonius bids Laertes 'character in his memory', owe some of their incisiveness to similar variations from the normal continuity of blank verse³.

Give every man thine ear, but few thy voice; |
Take each man's censure, but reserve thy judgment. |
Costly thy habit as thy purse can buy; |
But not expressed in fancy, rich not gaudy; |
For the apparel oft proclaims the man. |

¹ II. 8. 1. Cf. I. 12. 3, I. 32. 1.

² I. 2. 30. Cf. III. 14. 10, where he turns from one set of persons to another and changes his tone. At I. 12. 27 (where a semi-colon is generally printed) there is not, I think, any

pause at all; a comma would be sufficient, as in I. 20. 2. This, however, is the nearest approach I can find to negligence in the matter.

³ *Hamlet* I. 3. 60.

Neither a borrower nor a lender be ; |
 For loan oft loses both itself and friend, |
 And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry. |

And the same principle made a modest success for

Nothing venture nothing win.
 Blood is thick but water thin.
 In for a penny in for a pound.
 'Tis love that makes the world go round.

Of course this would, in the circumstances, justify the metre, or rather non-metre, of 'hoc tene etc.,' but poetry does not often admit the style of a *memoria technica*.

There is in Horace only one such break which appears to me, if I may venture to say so, bad ; that in I. 25. 6—

parcius iunctas quatiunt fenestras
 ictibus crebris iuvenes protervi,
 nec tibi somnos adimunt, amatque
 ianua limen,
 quae prius multum facilis movebat
 cardines : *audis* minus et minus iam ;
 'me tuo longas pereunte noctes,
 Lydia, dormis?'

I can see no justification for this break, of which the only effect is to aggravate the rather lagging relative clause before it ; and I cannot help suspecting that the poet really wrote

amatque
 ianua limen.
 quae prius multum facilis movebat
 cardines, *audit* etc.

The personified door which 'used to turn a ready hinge' for the suitor, and—now that it has little else to 'love'—has fallen in love with the threshold, the door which is, in fact, a mere type for Lydia herself, may very well be said to 'hear' the supplication¹.

It has been already said that *hiatus* in the proper sense, the non-elision of a *short* vowel, where there is no stop to justify it, is absolutely prohibited in the *Sapphic* of Horace.

¹ Cf. Cat. LXVII., a dialogue between the poet and a *ianua* about the altered circumstances of the house. See Munro *Elucidations* p. 158.

Such non-elision is permitted only at the strongest stops, and there very seldom¹. I am myself decidedly of opinion that Horace observed this rule in his lyric verse generally. When it is considered from what a vast number of instances the rule is collected; when we see that even in such a metre as that of I. 4,

solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni,
trahuntque siccas machinae carinas,

(where the dactylic and iambic elements in the metre might excuse an arbitrary treatment of the final syllable), Horace is so careful of his junctures that the only collision of *long* vowels which he permits is in a Greek word²; it passes belief that he could write two lines violating the rule *and recite them*, mentally or actually, and not know what he had done. If the reader will study the facts, I feel sure he will satisfy himself, that where we find a short vowel not elided, we must choose between two alternatives. Either the breach of continuity has a motive, which it is the business of criticism to discover, or the text is wrong. Nor will the conviction be weakened by the nature of the very few exceptions occurring in the traditional text. Take for instance I. 11.

tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi
finem di dederint, Leuconoë, nec Babylonios
tentaris numeros. ut melius quidquid erit pati!
seu plures hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam,
quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare
Tyrrhenum, sapias, vina liques, et spatio brevi
spem longam reseces. dum loquimur fugerit invida
aetas: carpe diem quam minimum credula postero.

If I may speak frankly, the juncture *invida aetas* (unless we

¹ A short unelided vowel occurs within the line at III. 14. 11 if *male ominatis* be the right reading. But the juncture is perfectly euphonious, and in fact *maleominatis* is one word like *leonum*.

² v. 9 *myrto aut*, cf. I. 25. 18 *myrto, aridas*. In that strange riddle I. 28 there are 3 collisions, vv. 17, 23, 28, all of the kind which are admitted in what

we may suppose to be the earlier or for some reason less carefully finished Sapphic. The only *hiatus* proper in the *Odes*, which I see any reason to think genuine, is at the end of a hexameter I. 7. 25, and that is at a stop, though weak. To the dactylic hexameter the rule, according to Greek analogy, would not apply.

are meant, which is scarcely conceivable, to read it *invid' aetas*) just destroys the poem, regarded as a piece of musical and rhythmical *sound*. It is indeed likely that the reader, unless a professional student of these things, has passed it repeatedly without notice. For it is evident from many commentaries on Horace, that modern *readers*, not being accustomed like the Romans to recitation, but apprehending poetry chiefly through the eye, and being strange or at least not native to the subtleties of quantity, do not in general *hear* Horace at all, and therefore naturally treat such things as *juncture* with indifference. Thus on II. 18. 30 there is a well-known controversy, important to the sense, as to whether a certain vowel is long or short.

nulla certior tamen
rapacis Orci fine destinata
aula divitem manet
erum.

Is *destinata* ablative or nominative? Some support this, the majority (in my opinion of course rightly) that; but the metre, in itself almost decisive, is seldom or never mentioned. To the ear of Horace the difference between the junctures *destinatā aula* and *destinatŭ aula* was in lyric poetry vital¹. But as it is commonly neglected, where, as here, the sense might bring it into notice, it is not likely to attract attention in *Tu ne quaesieris*. To return now to that poem—it is short, and has evidently been finished with much care, surpassing even IV. 10 of the same length and metre. It has no break

¹ The evidence of the Epodes completes on this point a perfect induction. In the common metre of the Epodes, the juncture of the lines is indifferent (or nearly so), and the consequence is, that Epodes II and XV (94 lines in all) contain more cases of *hiatus* than our text exhibits in all the Odes together; Epod. II. 9, 31, 46. Epod. XV. 4, 8, 22; see also Epod. I. 11, IV. 13; VIII. 19, XI. 20, XIII. 4, XVI. 19, 28, XVII. 43. Further Epodes XI. and XIII. have in the alternate verses a subordi-

nate division of the line, where both long and short final vowels may stand; but while *collision* is allowed, *hiatus* is not; Epod. XI. 6, 10, 26, Epod. XIII. 8, 10, 14, with Epod. XI. 14, 24. On the particular question of Od. II. 18, it might, indeed, be argued, that even an Ode in the *Hipponaectean* Metre is as likely to agree with the Epodes as with the other Odes. I do not think the probabilities, even in this case, equal by any means, but at any rate the general argument is not affected.

(except that under discussion), and no elision; IV. 10 has one elision, necessary to bring the word (*Ligurinum*) into the verse, and made in the favourite manner of Horace at the caesura and before a monosyllabic preposition. (Why this particular form was euphonious to Horace may not be clear, but his preference is easily ascertained.) Further, but for *invida aetas*, the poem would show the same 'strophic' treatment which has already been pointed out in III. 13 and elsewhere. There are (or rather would be, if *v.* 7 ended with a long syllable) two stanzas, in each of which the first line differs slightly in metre from the others, the *metrical* beat indicated being

tú ne quæsierís, scíre nefás, quém mihi, quém tibi
finem dī dederínt, Leúconoé: nēc Babylóniós etc.:

and

quaé nunc ôppositís débilitát púmíciíbús mare
Týrrhenúm, sapiás, etc¹.

Now if *invida aetas* be right, and if there is nothing peculiar in the pronunciation or rhetoric of the passage, all this care is entirely thrown away. Every line in the *Odes* is a fresh instruction to the reciter that, unless the sense requires a strong stop, the letters *invida aetas* must stand for the sound *invid' aetas*, that such a pronunciation as *invidă aetas* is impossible to the lyric Muse. The same applies with even greater force to I. 16. 27,

dum mihi
fias recantatis amica
opprobri's, animumque reddas,

with greater force because the elision neglected is of the type (before the monosyllabic preposition) which Horace specially affects; and in both cases, the negligence occurs just where it is most obnoxious, in the close of the poem, the last sounds left upon the ear. Surely these are facts which must have had an

¹ Observe that the punctuation assists this effect, each stanza having the main stop in the same place, *v.* 3 *numeros*, *v.* 7 *reseces*. This fact confirms an objection, which might be drawn from the general rhythm of the verse and the punctuation of I. 18, IV.

10, to the stopping *Tyrrhenum. Sapias*. I. 18 is clearly not strophic; it has one ending which may be read short *v.* 3 *proposuit, neque | mordaces* etc.; *neque*, for some reason which I do not understand, is several times so placed by Horace.

explanation; though we may not now be able to discover it. And indeed the explanation, though transparently simple, accords so little with an English conception of language and metre, that I should fear to propound it, if I were not able to cite authorities which will not be contemned. Catullus, in *Poem 76*, is credited by the MSS. with the pentameter

quare cur te iam amplius exerucies?

Mr Munro¹ restores

quare cur te iam *a!* amplius exerucies?

which, considering the tendency of Latin to these *interjections* (as in Latin they really were), and "the fondness of Catullus" for this one in particular, seems, when done, obvious enough. Horace would assuredly not have written *iam a!*, not being so well content as Catullus with the genuine language of the Romans. But he learnt from Catullus, as from every one; and nothing could be more in his manner than to use with 'art' what Catullus used with nature. If the last syllables of *invida* and *amica* be lengthened into sighs (which is the effect in sound of writing *invida a!* and *amica a!*), the metre is saved. Whether the rhetoric loses, the reader must decide. Catullus would not have disliked it, for he wrote

num te leaena montibus Libystinis
aut Scylla latrans infima inguinum parte
tam mente dura procreavit ac tetra
ut supplicis vocem in novissimo casu
contemptam haberes *a!* nimis fero corde?²

bringing in his *a!* precisely as Horace, to give emphasis to the close. Nor did Horace dislike such an end to the line, for he wrote,

ad non amicos heu mihi postes et heu
limina dura³.

¹ *Elucidations* p. 207, citing for the unelided interjection Hor. Epod. 5. 71, Tib. (Lygdamus) III. 4, 82, (Sulpicia) IV. 11. 3.

² Cat. 60.

³ Epod. XI. 21. A hiatus, which, to

judge from Horace's general practice, he would have found highly objectionable, may be avoided in a similar way in I. 2. 47, *neve te nostris vitiis iniquum O! ocior aura tollat*. The close juncture of the two last lines of the

The remaining examples are I. 17. 13 *dis pietas meā* | *et Musa cordi est*: and II. 13. 7, 8, *penetralia sparsisse nocturno cruorē* | *hospitis*; *ille venena Colchā* | *et quidquid usquam concipitur nefas* etc. To these may be applied, with at least equal strength, the argument by which Bentley disposed of the exceptions to the law of continuity in the anapaests of Greek tragedy—they cannot be the effects of chance, because they are (1) too few and (2) too easily corrected. Bentley inferred that the exceptions were false readings; strictly he should have inferred that they must *either* be false readings *or* be justified by special circumstances; and his rule has since received a qualification accordingly. If it can be shown what was the object of Horace in thus surprising the ears of his audience, we can believe these exceptions genuine¹. Till then, it must remain more probable that they are clerical errors. To correct such errors with certainty is of course impossible unless, which is not the case here, there is only one likely way. The originals may have been e.g. *dis pietas mea et dis musa cordi est*, or *dis pietas meis et musa cordi est*, and in the other place (where the alternative *Colchica* is actually given by the MSS.) *penetralia sparsisse nocturnos cruores hospitis*; *ille venena Colchica et quidquid* etc., which would be an imitation, quite in the author's manner, of a construction familiar in the Greek poets².

Sapphic is very common. Similarly in III. 9. 22, *tu levior cortice et improbo iracundior Hadria*, the last syllable of *improbo* has the accent of an exclamation, which accounts for the single collision in the piece. Whether we write *improbo O!* or not makes no difference in recitation.

¹ As II. 13. 5—12 exhibits three exceptions in eight lines (7, 8, 11), it might be argued that they are genuine and mark arbitrary pauses, the effect of excitement. But this is improbable in the face of the careful juncture of vv. 6 and 7, where the *ā* of *penetralia* is lengthened before the double consonant.

² As a Greek grammar would say, 'the verbal phrase *sparsisse-cruores* (blood-besprinkle) governs the accusative object *penetralia*'. Compare the 'accusative of the part affected' in II. 7. 7, the 'accusative in apposition to the sentence' in III. 20. 7, and the numerous Greek infinitives and genitives. For the plural *cruores* see the Dict. s. v. In Epod. v. 87, it seems the better view that the construction is *venena non valent convertere-humanam-vicem magnum fas nefasque*, 'Spells cannot make human change in the (divine) law of right and wrong', *vicem* being the quasi-cognate accusative to *convertere*. In III. 19. 15 *tres (cyathos)*

The case is scarcely less strong against the non-elision (except at strong stops) of the syllable *-ŭm*. It is elided constantly, and at the end of the line as well as elsewhere. To neglect the elision for mere convenience is therefore a gross offence against euphony. The artist who appeals—and Horace makes this appeal, if ever poet did—to the close attention of the ear cannot afford to write at one time

Phraaten

dissidens plebi numero beator'
eximit virtus (II. 2. 18),

or

tibi tollit hinnit'

apta quadrigis equa (II. 16. 34),

or

cum pace delabentis Etrusc'
in mare (III. 29. 35),

and at another time, as if it were a matter of no consequence,

neve te nostris vitiis iniquum
ocior aura tollat (I. 2. 47)

or

te triste lignum, te caducum
in domini caput immerentis (II. 13. 11).

Both ways cannot have been natural or euphonious to the same ear. The apparent cases of non-elision are, I think, six—the two just given, and the following,

dis carus ipsis, quippe ter et quater
anno revisens aequor Atlanticum—
impune (I. 31. 14),

cur apricum

oderit campum (I. 8. 3),

nec Iubae tellus generat leonum
arida nutrix (I. 22. 15),

and

antequam stantes repetat paludes
imbrium divina avis imminetum,
oscinem corvum prece suscitabo (III. 27. 10).

prohibet supra rixarum metuens tangere Gratia, the position of *tangere* shows that Horace has not forgotten the Greek *μαχῶν φοβερὰ θιγεῖν Χάρις*, the *Grace who shrinks from touching quarrel*, literally *fearful of quarrels to touch*

them. Of course *tangere* also governs *cyathos*, or to speak more correctly the verb mentally supplied after *prohibet* may be either *petere* (from v. 14) or *tangere*. But I must not stray into a disquisition on 'Graecisms'.

In I. 31. 13 the correction *Atlanticon* would be easy and legitimate; but upon reflexion it will be seen that there is really no collision at all. Whatever be read, a pause before *impune* is required for the point. The self-approving merchant used the word in the sense of *unharmed*, the poet clearly in the sense of *unpunished* (see I. 3. 23). When the last word of a sentence has this sort of significant emphasis, the voice naturally pauses before it; and the verse is so written as to make this pause necessary.

Of I. 2. 47 I have spoken already¹; the principle applying to it extends also to II. 13. 11, a place obviously appropriate for an interjection (perhaps *heu*), answering to the English *Fie!* Two of the others are probably right, but are not to the point. In III. 27. 10 some perceptible pause is natural after the long clause *antequam...imminentum*, and moreover the final syllable of this genitive had possibly a long vowel *u*, and was therefore a different sound from that in *apricum*, *iniquum*, *caducum*. The same reason justifies *leonū' arida*. In I. 8. 3 I have myself not much doubt that the true reading is *apricus*. The meaning is, 'Why has Sybaris, who (in summer) could stand any extreme, now (in winter) turned delicate, shrinking from the cold of the *Campus* and the river?' For the sense of *apricus*, and the use of the word in the *Odes*, see the note on p. 143².

But the reader, though he be *patiens pulveris* as Sybaris himself, must by this time have had enough of this critical dust. As an excuse for raising it we may plead that, if Horace deserved the wreath of Melpomene, it was not till he had toiled for the condescension of Euterpe. And therefore let us join them together.

¹ See note 3 on p. 191.

² The inflexions *-em* and *-am* are on a somewhat different footing. They are not so often elided, never at the juncture, and seem to stand like long vowels at the boundary between what must be elided and what cannot be. The instances of non-elision in I. 15. 2,

III. 4. 76 and III. 24. 61 (-am), I. 18. 15, II. 5. 9, III. 24. 60, III. 27. 33 (-em) may therefore be genuine. In III. 24. 60 however there is a variant *hospites* adopted by some editors; and some of the others, especially III. 27. 33, where there is no stop at all, appear suspicious.

INDEX

TO PASSAGES IN THE ODES MENTIONED IN THE PRECEDING ESSAYS.

The references are to the pages.

BOOK I.

- I—4, 7, 49, 52, 120.
- II—55, 57, 94, 95, 98, 116, 135,
140, 179 to 181, 186, 191.
- III—26, 49, 55, 119, 120.
- IV—70, 108, 188.
- V—36, 108, 163, 184.
- VI—5, 49, 111.
- VII—49, 108, 111, 188.
- VIII—80, 108, 143, 163, 193.
- IX—8, 108.
- X—72, 73.
- XI—8, 113, 164, 188.
- XII—5, 8, 57, 60, 94, 95, 114, 116,
179 to 181, 185, 186.
- XIII—8, 165.
- XIV—8, 94, 96, 184.
- XV—8, 163, 194.
- XVI—152, 190.
- XVII—8, 37, 108, 109, 150, 164,
169, 192.
- XVIII—36, 37, 46, 50, 109.
- XIX—116, 164.
- XX—37, 49, 65, 102, 108, 144,
146 to 149.
- XXI—72.
- XXII—8, 108, 150, 164, 169, 193.
- XXIII—164, 184.
- XXIV—1 to 3, 8, 119.
- XXV—109, 163, 187.
- XXVI—8, 109, 116, 121 to 133, 143.
- XXVII—8, 37, 163.
- XXVIII—63.
- XXIX—50, 116, 120.
- XXX—5, 155.
- XXXI—42, 50, 112, 113, 141, 193.
- XXXII—50, 112, 113, 132, 183, 186.
- XXXIII—49, 152 to 157, 183, 184.
- XXXIV—6, 8, 70, 72, 94.
- XXXV—6, 8, 72, 94.

- XXXVI—8, 35, 37, 121 to 133, 164.
- XXXVII—8, 93, 94.
- XXXVIII—8, 93, 108.

BOOK II.

- I—5, 6, 93, 99.
- II—9, 17, 50, 53, 99, 116.
- III—9, 52, 54, 100, 109, 137 to
140.
- IV—8, 80, 119.
- V—9, 109, 156, 163, 194.
- VI—8, 49, 102, 103, 109.
- VII—8, 37, 38, 49, 50, 100, 109.
- VIII—7, 8, 72, 183, 186.
- IX—9, 26, 94, 100, 109, 116.
- X—9, 16, 17, 24, 26, 52, 53,
55, 81, 84, 99, 109, 186.
- XI—9, 38, 52, 54, 102, 103, 109,
163.
- XII—5, 8, 49, 67, 68, 85, 86.
- XIII—9, 50, 63, 67, 71, 102, 192
to 194.
- XIV—9, 18.
- XV—9, 18, 35, 50, 53, 65.
- XVI—8, 9, 49, 50, 52, 82, 100.
- XVII—8, 49, 102, 115.
- XVIII—8, 35, 48 to 57, 63, 99,
145, 189.
- XIX—8, 26, 62, 115, 183.
- XX—8, 49, 136.

BOOK III.

- I to VI—106.
- I—8, 52, 53.
- II—69.
- III—5, 77.
- IV—28, 58 to 62, 75, 80, 85,
102, 194.
- V—28, 62, 63, 116.
- VI—50, 67.

VII—7, 72, 109.
 VIII—49, 65 to 67, 88, 102 to
 105, 110, 116, 179.
 IX—7, 156, 166, 184.
 X—110, 163, 170.
 XI—77, 181, 185.
 XII—110.
 XIII—110, 184.
 XIV—12, 105, 157 to 161, 186,
 188.
 XV—50, 110, 163.
 XVI—49, 65, 110.
 XVII—110, 121 to 133, 141 to 145.
 XVIII—56, 110, 142.
 XIX—16, 17, 26, 33 to 56, 84,
 106, 110, 164, 192.
 XX—183.
 XXI—38, 49, 162.
 XXII—115.
 XXIII—110.
 XXIV—30, 32, 50, 56, 57, 106,
 115, 194.
 XXV—18, 19, 114.
 XXVI—183.
 XXVII—193, 194.

XXIX—5, 35, 49, 65 to 67, 88, 106,
 108, 116, 139, 146 to 149.
 XXX—7, 55, 71, 73.


BOOK IV.

I to XV—73 to 76, 168 to 172.
 I—37, 75.
 II—75.
 III—7, 75, 183.
 IV—75.
 V—75.
 VI—76 to 82.
 VII—75.
 VIII—75, 81.
 IX—75.
 X—75.
 XI—75, 169, 185
 XII—75.
 XIII—75, 170.
 XIV—75.
 XV—75.

Carm. Saec. 76, 174 to 176.







PA Verrall, Arthur Woollgar
6411 Studies literary and
Z5V47 historical in the odes of
Horace

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
